

New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 16042) to authorize the Commissioner of Navigation to change the names of vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 16043) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 16047) to donate one captured cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Tippecanoe, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) urging that the claims of the people of South Africa be heard at the peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolution (H. Res. 594) for the consideration of H. J. Res. 357; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 595) for the consideration of S. 2654; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, protesting against the canalization of the St. Lawrence River between Montreal and Lake Ontario; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Miss RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 16044) for the relief of Henry Buck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16045) for the relief of Amos Buck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16046) granting a pension to Theresa Arnold; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Petition of the Retail Merchants' Association, Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the luxury tax and asking that it be removed from the revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of the State of Ohio, urging the enactment of bill similar or identical with House bill 10550, providing for national ownership and Government operation of all railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of the adjutant general of the State of New York, relating to Senate bill 5500, amending the National Guard defense act of June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Ezra Betzar Society, of city of Milwaukee, Wis., urging against passage of Burnett bill (H. R. 13669), excluding immigration into United States for period of four years; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of annual convention of Will County, Ill., Farmers' Institute, asking that the President and Congress recognize the newly proclaimed government of Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of citizens of Pomfret, North Pomfret, Woodstock, South Royalton, and South Pomfret, Vt., favoring the repeal of the postal zone system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DILL: Petition of J. W. Allen and other residents of Spokane and Hillyard, Wash., urging national ownership and Government operation of all railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of Rotary Club of New York, requesting passage of bill to establish a national conservatory of music in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of United States soldiers of Lithuanian origin, in favor of freedom for Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of George S. Gardner, 3734 West Thirty-third Street, Cleveland, Ohio, and 45 other citizens, in favor of the repeal of the postal zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Petition of Central Trades and Labor Council of Olean, N. Y., favoring the retention of the railroads by the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Dunkirk, N. Y., favoring the retention of the railroads by the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, against persons who had declared intention of becoming citizens of United States and who left this country for the purpose of entering armies of enemy, that they should be forever debarred from reentry to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of Williamsport Board of Trade, of Williamsport, Pa., with reference to Government control of telephone and telegraph systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Sub-Lodge No. 545, International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron-Ship Builders, and Helpers of America, of Renovo, Pa., favoring Government ownership and operation of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Wellsboro Chamber of Commerce, of Wellsboro, Pa., with reference to the Federal control of telephone and telegraph systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of members of the Prospect Methodist Episcopal Church, at Bristol, Conn., indorsing league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, urging the discontinuance of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, urging an immediate appropriation by Congress for the purchase and improvement of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of Chamber of Commerce, Doylestown, Pa., favoring a reasonable period to allow for the necessary preparation and adjustment by the owners of the great wire systems under Federal control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 20, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we call upon Thy name because we are seekers after the truth. We are not afraid of the truth. With all our splendid traditions and all our inheritance of faith and character, with a passion that God has given to us out of the past for the things that are highest, we are not afraid to face the truth. We pray that that equipment for service that comes from the God of Truth may be given to each one of us that we may perform our duties as in the sight of God and receive Thy blessing upon a service well done. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. VARDAMAN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|--------------|-------------|------------|-----------|
| Caldwell | Kirby | Pollock | Thomas |
| Culbertson | La Follette | Ransdell | Thompson |
| Curtis | Lenrott | Saulsbury | Trammell |
| Fernald | McCumber | Shafroth | Underwood |
| France | Moses | Sheppard | Vardaman |
| Gay | Myers | Sherman | Walsh |
| Hale | Nelson | Smith, Ga. | Warren |
| Hardwick | Nugent | Smoot | Wolcott |
| Jones, Wash. | Overman | Spencer | |
| Kendrick | Page | Sterling | |
| Kenyon | Pittman | Sutherland | |

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff], is absent owing to illness.

Mr. CURTIS. I was requested to announce the absence of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRONNA, and Mr. KING answered to their names when called.

Mr. LODGE, Mr. REED, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. HARDING, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. NEW, Mr.

WATSON, Mr. POMERENE, and Mr. McKELLAR entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

Mr. LEWIS. The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is absent on important public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 195) providing for the filling of a proximate vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 15979) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further transmitted to the Senate resolutions on the life, character, and public services of Hon. JAMES H. DAVIDSON, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

The message also transmitted to the Senate resolutions on the life, character, and public services of Hon. WILLIAM A. JONES, late a Representative from the State of Virginia.

The message further transmitted to the Senate resolutions on the life, character, and public services of Hon. EDWARD E. ROBINS, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

The message also transmitted to the Senate resolutions on the life, character, and public services of Hon. JOSHUA F. C. TALBOTT, late a Representative from the State of Maryland.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have petitions signed by over 5,000 citizens of the State of Washington urging the passage of the bill which I introduced to deport alien slackers. In connection with these petitions I wish to read an extract from a telegram which I received from one of the principal draft officers in our State, in which, among other things, he says:

State Department now trying interfere with our legislature passing bill prohibiting alien slackers in public offices.

It seems to me that the State Department is going a long ways out of the way to prevent the action of the legislature in matters of this kind.

I present these petitions and ask that they be referred to the Committee on Immigration, which, I hope, will take action as soon as possible in reference to the measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be so referred.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I present a petition signed by about 45 citizens of South Dakota relating to the maintenance of the guaranteed price of wheat. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Farm, Stock and Home.]

WHEAT FARMERS MAY HOLD THE BAG.

There is a great deal of fog in the public mind about the guaranteed wheat price for 1919. The presidential proclamation set the price for all wheat grown in the United States during the year 1919 that is delivered prior to June 1, 1920, at \$2.20, Chicago. This was subsequently revised to \$2.23 to offset the raise in freight rates.

So far all is well, but unless Congress acts quickly and makes provision for the continuance of the United States Grain Corporation there will be no means of carrying out this guaranty. This statement has been questioned, but under date of December 27 Secretary Houston wrote:

"Up to this time no agency of the United States has been created and charged with the duty of making effective the guaranteed price under this proclamation.

"The carrying out of the guaranteed price of wheat 'harvested in the United States during the year 1919 and offered for sale before the 1st day of June, 1920,' fixed by the President's proclamation of September 2, 1918, in pursuance of the direction of the act of Congress of August 10, 1917, presents a much more difficult situation, of which Congress should be advised, and such agencies should be created and appropriations made, by Congress, as will insure the carrying out of the guaranteed price 'to every producer of wheat,' in its integrity."

There is a very strong effort being made, through telling how much carrying out this guaranty is going to cost, to induce Congress to let the necessary legislation go by default. "The only weekly farm paper in Minnesota" is aiding these efforts by parrotlike repetition of these statements. Farm, Stock and Home sent the following telegram to farm papers in the big winter wheat sections:

"Secretary Houston says unless Congress acts 1919 wheat price guaranty can not be carried out. This is most vital to your section, where wheat is already sown. We are sounding the alarm and asking subscribers to sign demand for legislation. Quick work vital."

Now, then, it is up to each farmer to personally offset the vicious propaganda that is being carried on to defeat the wheat price guaranty by protesting to Congress. There are only 48 days left of the present session of Congress from the date of this issue of Farm, Stock and Home. Send this petition when filled out to Farm, Stock and Home, and we will do the rest.

Do it to-day.

H. N. OWEN,

Publisher Farm, Stock and Home, Minneapolis, Minn.

I demand that Congress pass the necessary legislation to carry out the terms of the President's proclamation on the guaranteed wheat price for 1919.

Chairman securing these names will please sign his name here:

Name, N. G. Brito.

Post office, New Effington.

State, South Dakota.

Mr. SPENCER. I present a petition of the officers of the National Shakespeare Federation, praying for the appointment of a commission to secure a site and perfect the plans for a national Shakespeare peace memorial in the city of Washington, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Library.

The petition is as follows:

Petition to the Senate of the United States.

We, the undersigned, officers of the National Shakespeare Federation, hereby respectfully petition the Congress for the enactment of a law providing for a commission to secure a site and perfect the plans for a national Shakespeare peace memorial in the city of Washington, D. C., to commemorate the services and perpetuate the memory of the men and women who gave service or their lives in the defense of liberty and the cause of justice in the great war.

The said commission to consist of the following: The President of the United States, the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Library and the chairman of the House Committee on the Library, the Secretary of War, and the president of the National Shakespeare Association.

The construction of the national Shakespeare peace memorial building to be upon such a site and at such cost as shall be determined by the commission and approved by the Congress.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES,

President.

MARY E. CRAIGIE,

First Vice President.

H. H. WHEATON,

Corresponding Secretary.

H. D. FRUIT,

Chairman of Library Committee.

Mr. MOSES presented resolutions adopted by the congregation of the Union Church of South Wolfboro; of the congregation of the South Parish, of Charlestown; and of the Review Club, of Manchester, all in the State of New Hampshire, favoring the establishment of a league of nations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the faculty of the State Normal School, of Plymouth, N. H., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Central Labor Union of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for the continuation of the United States Employment Service, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present a number of petitions from various counties in Illinois on the subject of the importation of corn. I ask that the body of one be printed in the RECORD and that the others be merely noted.

The body of the petition is as follows:

ARGENTINE CORN PROTEST.

FEBRUARY 13, 1919.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

The undersigned growers of corn desire to direct your attention to the injustice which is being done to American farmers through the importation, free from duty, of corn from Argentina. The present tariff, going into effect October 3, 1913, placed corn upon the free list. In the first nine months following that date there was imported 11,843,193 bushels of corn, of which 11,123,281 bushels came from Argentina. This corn found a market along our Atlantic and Gulf seaboard, thereby displacing from our own domestic market an equal amount of American-grown corn. The effect of this invasion of the American market by Argentine corn is shown by the fact that in September, 1913, cash corn sold in Chicago as high as 78½ cents and in the following February as low as 61 cents. The world war then came on and so disorganized all world commerce and shipping that but little corn could be brought in while it continued. In December, 1918, however, the Food Administration removed all restrictions against the importation of Argentine corn, and the price of American corn declined 15 cents a bushel upon the mere threat of renewal of Argentine imports.

Under normal conditions of ocean shipping corn can be brought from Argentina to New York or New Orleans at no greater cost of transportation than the present rail cost of shipping it by rail from central Illinois to the same points. It follows, therefore, that American farmers, in order to hold the seaboard markets of this country, must be prepared to sell their corn at as low a first price as can the Argentine farmer. The injustice is manifest when it is recalled that it has always been the policy of the United States to so maintain its tariffs as to prevent home competition upon a basis that reduces the American scale of living. Argentina, by reason of low wages and the low scale of living of its farm labor, can produce corn at a figure with which we

can not compete except by a similar lowering of wages and standards of living.

The undersigned respectfully urge that the tariff duty of 6 cents per bushel be restored upon corn.

Mr. SHERMAN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Streator, Mineral, Grand Ridge, Sheffield, and Ransom, all in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the importation free of duty of corn from Argentina, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry employees of Rock Island Arsenal, Ill., praying that the Government manufacture in its own shops the equipment, etc., used in the War, Navy, mercantile marine, Postal Service, etc., instead of letting large contracts to private concerns and corporations, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Lowell, Mass., praying that the return to private ownership of the telephone and telegraph lines be deferred until Congress shall have studied the question and determined upon a safe procedure to be followed in the future, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Aldermen of Somerville, Mass., praying for the establishment of a league of nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a memorial of the Sunday School of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Romulus, Mich., remonstrating against the proposed prohibition on importation of various kinds of trees, shrubs, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kalamazoo, Mich., praying for the proposed five-year extension of Federal control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Middleville Brotherhood, of Middleville, Mich., praying for the granting of six months' additional pay to honorably discharged soldiers and sailors, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the local draft board for Oceana County, Mich., praying for the deportation of those aliens who, in order to escape military service, dropped their first citizenship papers, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of North Star, Mich., praying for the establishment of a league of nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Adrian, Mich., remonstrating against the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange No. 67, Patrons of Husbandry, of Charlotte, Mich., praying for national prohibition, which was ordered to lie on the table.

WORK OF THE PHILIPPINE LEGISLATURE.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I have here a report of the Acting Governor General of the Philippine Islands concerning the action of the Legislature of the Philippine Islands in which a review is made of the excellent work that has been done by those legislative bodies. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANILA, February 12, 1919.

SECRETARY OF WAR,
Washington, D. C.:

February 10. Yesterday morning the regular session of the Philippine Legislature was ended, and it is with great satisfaction that I am able to inform you that the labors realized during this session will be of great and lasting value to this country and unsurpassed by any previous session in their permanent influence upon its general welfare. Anticipating detailed information of all the legislation just enacted, which will be forwarded later, I desire to call your attention to some of the most important measures adopted, and to the spirit and character shown by the legislature during the last two years. The most important measure, in my judgment, is that by which over P30,000,000 was appropriated for the extension of universal free education to all the children of the islands. This act is of prime importance, not only because it provides funds for a term of years sufficient to extend a primary education of seven grades to all the children of school age but also because it enables the bureau of education to prepare and carry into execution a complete and systematic development of the existing excellent educational plan which lacked only extension over the entire field. Furthermore, it is a means of incalculable value for the welfare of the Filipino people, since it will banish illiteracy, establish permanently English as the common language of the land, afford a firm foundation for democratic institutions, and insure order and stability to the insular government. The adoption of this thoroughly American educational measure will tend greatly to lift the moral responsibility incumbent on the United States to secure a firm and orderly government, and aside from the differences of opinion which may have existed among American statesmen in the past, it has been advocated by all Americans

from the beginning of the occupation that universal free education of the masses should be an essential characteristic of our national policy in the Philippines. Inasmuch as when Congress considered paragraph 2, the acts of July 1, 19, and of August 29, 1916, much discussion was had about the political capacity of the Filipinos, I feel that I discharge a duty of conscience to call your attention to the fact that this enlightened measure was passed by the legislative department of the government, which, as you know, is composed entirely of Filipinos. By this law of universal free education the all-Philippine Legislature in the last two years has provided for doubling the quantity of the educational work effected in almost two decades of previous American occupation. Under the financial support previously given, it was necessary to turn away from the doors of the schoolhouses one-half of all the children of the islands. In five years all the children of the land will receive educational advantages. Besides this, the salaries of all municipal teachers will be increased 30 per cent. In addition, I direct attention to the fact that at the session of 1917-18 two normal schools were established and 2 more were established at the session just adjourned, all to be located by the secretary of public instruction, making, with 2 already existing, 6 such schools; also 4 agricultural schools were established in the session of 1917-18 and 3 more this year, making 17 in all. The College of Agriculture has just had its appropriation largely increased and an experiment station has been established in connection with it. The appropriation of this year for the university far exceeds any former appropriation. In addition to all this, the appropriation to the bureau of education for this current calendar year exceeds by P3,000,000 any former appropriation. Furthermore, legislative appropriation was made for pensioning 150 young men and women to be trained as specialists in the colleges of America and elsewhere, and they are expected to sail on August next. The heroic and unselfish work of American teachers, many of whom lost life or health, deserves, and should receive, the very highest praise, but it would be particularly unjust and unfair for me, as head of the department of public instruction, not to recognize and make known the work of Filipinos in this regard. Of the present teaching force of over 14,000 less than 3 per cent are Americans. The number of American teachers is gradually growing less as Filipino teachers are trained to take the important positions which they held.

Other important laws just passed provide for the increase of food products which, strange to say, in this land of wonderful soil wealth, are imported in large quantities from abroad; also legislation was effected for a geological survey of what are considered commercial oil fields, for the extension of the lines of the Government Railroad Co., for the revision of the internal-revenue law, with a view of making more effective its provisions, for the establishment of a Philippine income tax, for the extension to the mountain Province of the existing provincial and municipal organizations hitherto extended to Mindanao and Sulu, for constituting a metropolitan district for the extension and conservation for the water supply for Manila, and for a comprehensive sewer system. In addition, an appropriation was made for the erection of a mausoleum at the grave of William A. Jones in Virginia to express the grateful memory of the Filipino people for his generous and altruistic services to this country. With the object of organizing the production of the islands, developing its natural resources, establishing new industries, and, in general, stabilizing prices and making a fair market for the raw and manufactured products of the Archipelago, the legislature passed, by a unanimous vote in both houses, a law creating the National Development Co., with a capital of P50,000,000, of which the Governor General will be the chairman of the board of control; also a law was passed extending to June 30 next the time in the Osmeña Retirement Act, with the object of including in its benefits all employees, mostly Americans; some of these employees had continued until now in the public service and were in such service at the time of the passage of the original act, but did not then resort to the law, preferring to continue, and others had not served the time specified, so that they were unable to take advantage of it. Many faithful employees of the government had requested this, as expressed by memorials, and this action of the Philippine Legislature is a generous manifestation of its appreciation of the valuable services rendered the government by Americans. There are other important measures which will be duly reported.

The capacity for initiative and the constructive spirit evidenced by the legislature, the first organized under the Jones law, is worthy of great commendation. Its capacity to investigate government problems and to act expeditiously, but with due caution, is certainly unprecedented in history, considering that for three centuries this people had practically no political rights and were debarred from the benefits of education. American legislative practice and procedure has always been examined and with few exceptions followed. As indicative, however, of their independent frame of mind, it may be noted that a single legislative committee has had charge of both appropriations and ways and means since 1907, and under the provisions of the Jones law has adopted substantially the basic principles of the English budget system, instead of maintaining a rigorous application of the theory of the separation of governmental powers as far as the legislative and executive departments are concerned, the latter directed by an American. This legislature has given to the secretaries of the various departments the right to appear before either house to defend publicly the measures proposed by the executive or to oppose measures originated in such houses. Finally, as one of the representatives in these islands of the United States, I wish to attest the patriotism of the Filipinos and their loyal attachment to the United States Government. This legislature, which has just terminated its sessions, has acted with judgment and prudence in what it has done and left undone during its term now drawing to a close, and should be credited for the wisdom with which it has guided and directed the Filipino people in the paths of order and tranquility during these recent years of almost universal turmoil and unrest. Perfect peace prevailed here, and all provincial and municipal government instrumentalities of force have had no function to perform.

YEATER,
Acting Governor General.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 5566) for the relief of the claimants of certain unsurveyed lands in Mississippi County, Ark. (Rept. No. 746); and

A bill (H. R. 12082) authorizing the sale of certain lands in South Dakota for cemetery purposes (Rept. No. 745).

Mr. HITCHCOCK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 5512) to amend the Federal farm-loan act, approved July 17, 1916, reported it without amendment (Rept. No. 748).

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (S. 5555) to amend the war-risk insurance act, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 749) thereon.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. ASHURST. I am directed by the Committee on Indian Affairs to report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 14746) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and I submit a report (No. 747) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

TOMBIGBEE RIVER BRIDGE, MISSISSIPPI.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I wish to report two bills from the Committee on Commerce, and I shall ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration. They are local bills for Mississippi, and they have the approval of the department.

First, from the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 14555) granting the consent of Congress to the board of supervisors of Itawamba County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Tombigbee River at or near Barrs Ferry, in said county, and I submit a report (No. 736) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the board of supervisors of Itawamba County, Miss., and their successors in office, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tombigbee River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Barrs Ferry, in the county of Itawamba, in the State of Mississippi, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PORT OF GULFPORT, MISS.

Mr. VARDAMAN. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 5999) for the establishment of Gulfport, Miss., as a port of entry and delivery for immediate transportation without appraisement of dutiable merchandise, and I submit a report (No. 737) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the privileges of the first and seventh sections of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement be, and are hereby, extended to the port of Gulfport, Miss.

Mr. SMOOT. From what committee is that bill reported?

Mr. VARDAMAN. From the Commerce Committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Similar bills in the past have always gone to the Finance Committee. I do not know why this bill should have gone to another committee.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I am not familiar with the custom in reference to the matter.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that every bill creating a port of entry of which I have known has been referred to the Finance Committee. However, I am not going to object.

Mr. NELSON. I will say that, while I do not know what the custom now is, I know that for many years, during the time I was chairman of that committee, such bills were referred to and reported by the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SMOOT. They may have been referred to two separate committees; and so I make no objection.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAHONING RIVER BRIDGE, OHIO.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 12995) granting the consent of Congress to the Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a combined bridge and dam across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio, and I submit a report (No. 744) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONNECTICUT RIVER BRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 13369) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Connecticut River, between Springfield and West Springfield, in Hampden County, Mass., and I submit a report (No. 743) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 13393) to revive and reenact the act entitled, "An act to authorize the city of South Sioux City, in the State of Nebraska, to construct a bridge across the Missouri River between the States of Nebraska and Iowa," approved April 22, 1912, and I submit a report (No. 742) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MONONGAHELA RIVER BRIDGE, PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 13427) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near the borough of Wilson, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I submit a report (No. 741) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE, PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 13647) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near McKees Rocks Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I submit a report (No. 740) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALLEGHENY RIVER BRIDGE, PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 13648) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Millvale Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I submit a report (No. 739) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALLEGHENY RIVER BRIDGE AT PITTSBURGH.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 13649) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Sixteenth Street, in the city of Pittsburgh, county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I submit a report (No. 738) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 5642) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Fort Ridgely State Park, Minn., three captured German cannons or fieldpieces;

A bill (S. 5643) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Waldorf, Minn., a captured German siege mortar; and

A bill (S. 5644) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate captured German cannons or fieldpieces to the municipalities of Mankato, Chisholm, and Wright, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 5645) for the relief of Charles W. Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 5646) to purchase a painting of Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. McKELLAR. I introduce a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 226) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any State, the legislature of which shall have voted for the ratification or adoption of this article of, or amendment to, the Constitution of the United States, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex: *Provided*, That no married woman shall be entitled to vote who would not be so entitled if she were a single woman.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

AMENDMENTS TO ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CALDER submitted an amendment providing that all retired officers of the Army who have been on active duty throughout the past emergency shall be promoted to the rank to which their length of service entitles them, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment relative to enlistments in the National Guard, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—CHARLES ST. JOHN NEELD.

Mr. POMERENE. On December 11, 1918, I introduced a special pension bill (S. 5173) granting a pension to Charles St. John Neeld. The young man has since died, and I want to request the return of the papers that were filed with the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. No adverse report was made on it?

Mr. POMERENE. I do not believe any report was made on the bill; but I shall have to verify that, as I am not sure about it.

Mr. SMOOT. If no adverse report was made on it, the order is all right.

Mr. POMERENE. I will have to inquire about it.

Mr. POMERENE subsequently said:

If I may have the attention of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], I wish to say that I have made inquiry about the bill to which I called the attention of the Senate a moment ago and I find that no report whatsoever has been made upon it.

Mr. SMOOT. Then there can be no objection whatever to the withdrawal of the papers.

Mr. POMERENE. I ask for the adoption of an order to withdraw the papers.

The order was reduced to writing and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That leave be granted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers accompanying the bill (S. 5173) granting a pension to Charles St. John Neeld, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ENLISTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5279)

to authorize the resumption of voluntary enlistments in the Regular Army, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. HITCHCOCK, and Mr. WARREN conferees on the part of the Senate.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5038) extending the use of the special fund for vocational education provided by section 7 of the vocational rehabilitation act, approved June 27, 1918, and authorizing the Federal Board for Vocational Education to accept gifts and donations for specific purposes, which were, on page 1, line 5, to strike out "is" and insert "together with the items of appropriation made by said act, are". On page 2, line 2, after "employment," to insert "and for supplementing any or all of the other items of appropriation made by said act"; on page 2, to strike out lines 3 to 19, inclusive, and to amend the title to read as follows: "An act extending the use of the special fund for vocational education provided by section 7 of the vocational rehabilitation act, approved June 27, 1918, and for other purposes."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I have conferred with a number of the members of the Committee on Education and Labor, to whom this bill and the House amendments were referred, and while we regret that the House has stricken out the provision which broadened the opportunity of gifts to this fund, we think, in view of the advanced time of the session, that it is best not to ask for a conference, but to concur in the action of the other House in amending the bill. I therefore move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I shall have to ask the Senator from Georgia to explain the House amendments or else I shall have to ask that the bill be read as proposed to be amended.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to have the bill read as proposed to be amended.

Mr. SMOOT. I certainly do not understand what effect those amendments will have upon the bill itself, and I therefore ask that the bill be read as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill as it will stand with the House amendments.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I desire—that the bill shall be read as it will stand with the House amendments.

The Secretary read the bill as proposed to be amended, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the special fund for vocational education, authorized by section 7 of the vocational rehabilitation act, approved June 27, 1918, together with the items of appropriation made by said act, are hereby made available, in addition to the purposes therein prescribed, for such other expenses as in the discretion of the board is deemed necessary and proper for the payment of necessary travel, lodging, subsistence, and other expenses of disabled men while under investigation by the board to determine their eligibility for training under the act, and the purchase of supplies, equipment, and clothing for disabled men when ready to enter employment, and the traveling expenses of such men to place of employment, and for supplementing any or all of the other items of appropriation made by said act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the House amendments.

The amendments were concurred in.

REGENT OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 195) providing for the filling of a proximate vacancy in the Board of Regents in the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress, which were, in line 5, to strike out "will occur" and insert "occurred"; and to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress."

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 15979. An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

OIL AND GAS LANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there concurrent or other resolutions? [A pause.] Morning business is closed.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 2812) to encourage and promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2812) to encourage and promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, this bill has passed the Senate three times. It has passed the House of Representatives three times.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, this is such an important measure that I should very much like to hear the speech of the Senator from Nevada, but there is so much confusion on the floor that we can not hear him.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I consider this bill of great importance. I desire to make a brief statement with regard to the conference report. I assume that the Senate will support the bill as it passed this body, unless it has been changed to such an extent that it is contrary to the sentiment of the Senate.

Let me say at the start that I think there is some misunderstanding with regard to the conference report; and as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] has been kind enough to indicate his interest in the matter, I desire to say that I shall welcome any question that he may propound to me with regard to the subject.

As I have heretofore said, this bill has passed the Senate three times, and it has passed the House three times, but this is the first time that the two bodies have ever been able to get together in an agreement.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. But the bill has not passed either the House or the Senate in the form in which it is now presented to us, has it?

Mr. PITTMAN. I really do not understand what the Senator means.

Mr. KENYON. I mean that as it passed the House it was entirely a leasing proposition, was it not?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes.

Mr. KENYON. And as it is presented to us now it is not only a leasing proposition, but a sale proposition. Now, what is the difference between the form in which the bill passed the House and the form in which it passed the Senate?

Mr. PITTMAN. I will try to explain it. If I should answer the question asked by the Senator by "yes" or "no," it would be misunderstood. I will say frankly at the start that, so far as coal lands are concerned, the Senate provided for either the sale or the leasing; that, so far as oil lands are concerned, the Senate provided solely for the leasing of oil lands, and the House provided solely for the leasing of oil lands. The conferees have agreed upon the provisions of the Senate bill for the sale or leasing of coal lands. Does that answer the question of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. KENYON. I do not know that it does exactly. The Senator made the statement that this bill had passed the House and also had passed the Senate, I think he said, two or three times. I do not understand that the bill, as it is embodied in the conference report now as the result of the conference, ever passed either House until the conference report was adopted by the House.

Mr. PITTMAN. The bill now before the Senate as embodied in the conference report is substantially the same as the first bill that passed the House of Representatives.

Mr. KENYON. That answers part of my question. Then has a bill ever passed the Senate practically identical with that passed by the House?

Mr. PITTMAN. Not identical. The bill that passed the Senate, to be frank with the Senator from Iowa, was what might be considered more favorable to claimants of oil lands under prior laws. That was the only difference. Both bills, so far as oil, sodium, phosphate, and the other minerals with regard to which it deals are concerned, are leasing propositions; in other words, with the exception of coal, the principle of leasing, thus reserving to the Government the control, is maintained in the bill. As to coal, it was urged upon the Senate that there were 44,000,000 acres of coal land; that there was a surplus of coal; that it required a great deal of money to

develop coal; and that the leasing system would not develop it. Consequently there was an optional provision placed in the bill that coal lands might be either purchased or leased, at the option of the person desiring to develop the coal lands, limiting the amount, however, that may be purchased.

Mr. KENYON. That was placed there by the conferees?

Mr. PITTMAN. No, sir; it was placed there by the Senate. The reason for that was this: It was contended before the Senate at the time that provision was adopted that the existing law failed to develop the coal lands of this country, resulting in a monopoly in favor of those who have coal lands. Why? Because coal lands had to be sold at a price fixed by appraisers, and that appraisement was fixed by geologists, and those geologists in every case, having a total disregard to the business conditions, fixed a price so high that nobody ever wanted to buy the land.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, under the provisions of this conference report that same practice is to be followed, is it not?

Mr. PITTMAN. No, sir.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like the Senator to point out why it will not be followed. There is no change whatever in the existing practice of the department made by this conference report.

Mr. PITTMAN. Possibly the Senator will save me time by showing where the report does that.

Mr. SMOOT. I will show the Senator, Mr. President, where it does.

Mr. PITTMAN. It is very kind of the Senator to do that; but it is not the case.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator say in a word how a sale of the coal under the pending conference report is to take place?

Mr. PITTMAN. With pleasure, as the Senator desires to have that information. Under the existing law with regard to coal—and the House reenacted the sale clause of the existing law with regard to coal—it is provided that 160 acres of coal land may be sold to a citizen at not less than the appraised value. Is that clear? Under the pending bill it is provided that coal lands may not be sold for less than a certain price, but at a price fixed by competitive bidding. That is the distinction.

Mr. SMOOT. But all of it can be—

Mr. PITTMAN. I am coming to that; I want this point made clear, and then I will come to that.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well.

Mr. PITTMAN. The distinction is this: Do not for one moment think that the House ever passed a bill that did not provide for the sale of coal lands. That has been charged, but it is not true. The House provided for the sale of coal lands—no one will deny that—and they provided for the sale of coal lands under the existing law at the appraised value. The pending measure provides for the sale of coal lands at the value established by competitive bidding; that is the only distinction. Now, what is the difference? In one case a geologist fixes a price which is impracticable; in the other case, business men fix the price by competitive bidding. I know what is in the mind of the Senator from Iowa—and it was in the mind of the committee—that there might not be fair competition in the bidding; it is possible that the real value might not be determined by that method; but there is reserved in the very act that the Secretary may refuse to accept any bids which he considers unfair.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator's conception of the word "unfair" as used in this report.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, "unfair" is a word that has been used in connection with every condition of life. I have heard of businesses that were unfair. I have heard of enterprises that were unfair. I have heard every character of enterprise of life spoken of in that connection as unfair. I think it is the broadest term, if the Senator will permit me—and I understand the reason of his question—that can be used.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, does the Senator then think that the word "unfair" in his definition would be synonymous with the word "unreasonable"?

Mr. PITTMAN. I do.

Mr. LENROOT. In other words, a bid might be entirely fair, so far as good faith is concerned; but, if the Secretary should be of the opinion that the land was worth more than the bid, under this language does the Senator think that he could reject the bid?

Mr. PITTMAN. I do; and I will say frankly to the Senator from Wisconsin that such was the idea of the committee. Every member of the committee, as I understand—and I think

the Senator from Utah will bear me out—mentioned that very subject, that in the end the Secretary of the Interior could say that any bid was unfair to the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator, I think, states that correctly as far as the members of the committee are concerned; but that very fact goes to allow the Secretary of the Interior to reject any bid that may be made, in case it does not conform to the report made by a geologist in his department as to the value of the coal land. In other words, in my State we have coal land valued at \$475 an acre. That land can be put up by competitive bidding for sale; and, supposing that it was a fair competitive bidding, and the highest bidder bid \$300 an acre, the Secretary of the Interior has a perfect right to reject that bid.

Mr. PITTMAN. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly what is stated in this bill. Therefore, Mr. President, while the wording is entirely different from the present law, the result of the competitive bidding is exactly the same, because the Secretary of the Interior has a perfect right to reject any and all bids.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I have the very highest respect for the opinion of the Senator from Utah with regard to these matters, but I am compelled to differ with him in regard to the construction. While it is true that the Secretary of the Interior may use his discretion to refuse to make any sale, there is a distinction in this, that under the old law he was arbitrarily bound by the determination of one witness, the appraiser, while under the present law he may accept the testimony of a dozen witnesses in forming his opinion as to the value. That is the distinction.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. PITTMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to read a telegram that I received this morning from the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN]. I suppose he sent it to me with the idea that I should acquaint the Senate with his view upon the pending matter. He wires:

Regret my unavoidable absence, as I am much interested in oil-lands leasing bill, a compromise measure which will be accepted by operators as a settlement and help to restore normal industrial conditions. May I not ask you to be present and consider it when called up by Senator PITTMAN to-morrow, Thursday, immediately on convening of Senate?

I thought it was fair to the Senator from California for everybody to know his views upon the subject, as everybody knows how active he has been in connection with this sort of legislation.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Wisconsin? I am particularly interested right now, before I pass from this statement, to have the attention of the Senators, because if I am in error or if I have misunderstood anything I want their correction.

I take it that the present bill does not change existing law with regard to coal, except in this respect, that under the existing law the Secretary is bound by the appraisal of a geologist, and under the proposed law he accepts the evidence of the geologist.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator whether under the existing law he is bound, except as he chooses to be bound, by the appraised value? The only thing there is in the existing law is the minimum price.

Mr. PITTMAN. He is bound just exactly as the Senator has stated.

Mr. LENROOT. But the minimum is fixed in the law at the same rate that is fixed in this proposed legislation.

Mr. PITTMAN. But there is a further proviso that it shall not be sold for less than the appraised value.

Mr. LENROOT. I think the Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. PITTMAN. I think not.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; the Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I know, from my own investigation, that there have been coal lands sold in my State for less than the appraised value. It has been brought about by a compromise between the purchasers and the Secretary of the Interior. I have never objected to that, and I do not object to it now. All that I stated in the first place was that the result of this provision is exactly the same as existing law.

Mr. PITTMAN. Oh, well, Mr. President, I will accept the statement of the Senator that it is the same as existing law, because it is not a material section of the bill. If it is the same as existing law, it is the same as the House provision. I think

it is a little more flexible; but whether it is or whether it is not, it is not a material provision.

Now, as to the oil.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, before the Senator passes from the coal-land provisions, he stated, as I understood him, that the coal-land section of the conference report was the same as the bill passed by the Senate.

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask the Senator whether, in both the Senate bill and the House substitute, so far as leasing is concerned, the Territory of Alaska was not excluded?

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I understand the purpose of the Senator's question, of course; and therefore I might as well answer it directly without waiting.

The bill passed by the Senate included Alaska. The bill passed by the House expressly included Alaska in the leasing provision. Nine out of ten of the conferees—and the conferees of the House represented the progressive element of the Congress—voted to include Alaska, and I will tell you why. Listen to this letter—

Mr. LENROOT. Before the Senator reads that—

Mr. PITTMAN. I am going to tell you why.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask the Senator a preliminary question. By what authority did the conferees include Alaska?

Mr. PITTMAN. I have already stated by what authority—because the bill provided for the leasing or disposition of all coal and oil lands of the United States.

Mr. LENROOT. Outside of Alaska.

Mr. PITTMAN. Not in the Senate bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, I have it here.

Mr. PITTMAN. Well, then, I will ask the Senator to read it.

Mr. LENROOT (reading)—

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to lease any deposits of coal or lignite owned by the United States, outside of the Territory of Alaska—

Mr. PITTMAN. In the Senate bill?

Mr. LENROOT. That is the Senate bill. The House bill reads:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to, and upon the petition of any qualified applicant shall, divide any of the coal lands or the deposits of coal, classified and unclassified, owned by the United States outside of the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand the comparative print of the two bills. As to coal, the Senate bill reads as follows:

COAL.

SEC. 2. That any citizen or any association composed of persons severally qualified by law to enter coal lands, or any corporation incorporated under and by virtue of the laws of any State or Territory, or any municipality of any State or Territory, shall, upon application to the register of the proper land office, have the right to enter by legal subdivisions any quantity of vacant coal lands of the United States within any State or Territory of the Union not otherwise appropriated by competent authority, not exceeding 2,560 acres.

Mr. LENROOT. I was referring to the provision in regard to the leasing of coal land.

Mr. PITTMAN. I am referring to the provision covering coal land.

Mr. LENROOT. The section to which the Senator now refers covers only the sale. The next section covers the leasing; and section 3 in both the Senate bill and the House bill expressly excluded the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, that is a point of order that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, in his effort to defeat legislation on this subject, is now urging upon the Senate in an indirect way.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator has not made the point of order. The Senator was inquiring.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator is getting ready to do so.

Mr. LENROOT. No.

Mr. PITTMAN. It is one of the theories, I assume, of the other side of this Chamber, which the Senator will develop in proper time.

Mr. LENROOT. Let me say to the Senator that the Senator from Wisconsin has not up to this time expressed any opposition to the bill. He is inquiring for information in the utmost good faith.

Mr. PITTMAN. I am very glad to hear it.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I thought the Senator invited us to inquire for information. That was my only purpose. That does not mean that we are opposed to the proposition at all.

Mr. PITTMAN. I assure the Senator from Iowa that any time he asks a question I shall be very pleased to try to answer it. What I meant was that it was developing an argument which is apparent to all of us, and that is the reason why I made that remark. I wanted to deal with facts and not with a technical argument.

Now, I trust that there is no further question with regard to coal.

The same provision with regard to coal now exists that existed in the House bill, except that in the House bill some contend that the Secretary is bound by the appraisal, while others contend that he is not. In the Senate bill it is clear that he may use the appraisal as evidence. Now, that is all.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the Senator started to tell us, before he was diverted, the reason for this change as to Alaska. Will he please tell us?

Mr. PITTMAN. I thank the Senator from calling my attention to it. I was diverted. I ask that the Secretary read this letter from the Secretary of the Interior, which moved the committee to act in the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The SECRETARY. Reading from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 18, page 3707:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 1, 1919.

HON. SCOTT FERRIS,
Chairman Public Lands Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FERRIS: On December 10, 1917, you transmitted a copy of resolutions passed by the Cordova, Alaska, Chamber of Commerce with reference to the pending general leasing bill, and particularly with reference to deposits of coal and oil. One of the matters urged was that the pending bill be modified so as to make its provisions relating to the sale of coal lands applicable to Alaska. In my reply of January 4, 1918, I advised you, in effect, that the reason this provision was not included was that there is now a special leasing law applicable to that Territory, enacted October 20, 1914 (38 Stat., 741), and that this law has not been in operation long enough for the department to determine whether it will be successful and adapted to the development of Alaska's coal resources.

Since the above letter was written there has been further opportunity to learn whether the Alaska coal-leasing bill is suitable to conditions in the Territory, and I have concluded that it is not entirely so. There has been but little inquiry for these lands and only limited development.

Four leases were granted under the present law, and but two of these were able to finance the small operations thus far begun.

After further study of the situation, I have come to the conclusion that perhaps the field would be more inviting to coal operators if title were granted as in the States, especially since Alaskan operations are so far away from the bases of labor and supply.

I therefore recommend that Alaska be placed on the same footing as the States in the pending bill, and that operators in that field have the same choice of lease and purchase as accorded elsewhere. Otherwise Alaska coal lands will remain in a disadvantageous position.

The Territory of Alaska is now included in the oil provision of the bill, this giving it the same law as the States, which will be an advantage in the administration of the law, because the same rulings would apply to both the States and the Territories, and will obviate the necessity of administering and construing two different laws on the same subject.

I am therefore of the opinion that not only would it be in the interest of the development of the Alaska coal lands to have the provisions of the pending bill made applicable to Alaska, but that it would also be conducive to good administration of the laws.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE, Secretary.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, that is the reason why the conference committee unanimously, I believe, agreed to confirm the provision of the Senate bill for the optional privilege of the Secretary to sell coal lands in Alaska, as well as to lease them. I think that answers that question.

I was one of the most ardent supporters of the leasing bill for Alaska. I hoped that it would succeed, and I still believe it may succeed. I know, however, Secretary Lane was an ardent supporter of the leasing system, and when he came to us and asked us to adopt the Senate provision giving him the power to sell a limited quantity of that coal land, we did it. That was all.

Now, as to the oil. The Senate, in dealing with the oil situation, did not disturb that portion of the public domain which was reserved for the benefit of the Navy. The Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior reserve certain of the public lands which were supposed to carry or did carry oil for the use and benefit of the Navy. In our bill providing for the leasing of oil lands we eliminated all that land. The House, however, incorporated in its bill a provision for the development of those Navy reserves. The provision in the House bill was that the claimant of an oil well, or rather the claimant of a mining claim under existing law who had developed an oil well that was producing, should have the right, upon the surrender of all claim of title to the mining claim under existing law, to a lease of the well.

That provision was drawn by the Secretary of the Navy, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of the Interior. We adopted that in toto. In other words, as far as the Navy reserves were concerned, we have adopted everything that the Department of the Navy, the Interior Department, and the Department of Justice have asked us to adopt. As far as the Navy reserves are concerned, we reached a compromise. The House bill provided that outside naval oil reserves where a man had developed an oil well in good faith, without fraud, upon the public domain under the belief that he was doing it under existing law, he should have a right to a lease on the claim, provided he surren-

dered all claim of title, at a royalty of not less than one-eighth, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, both as to past royalty and as to future royalty.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield for a question there?

Mr. PITTMAN. Just let me finish this statement. The Senate bill provided expressly that the royalty should be a fixed amount, one-eighth, as to past production and future production. The compromise was that as to past production, which had probably been expended in the form of dividends or costs of new developments, there should be a fixed royalty of one-eighth, and as to the future royalties under the lease it should be not less than one-eighth and as much more as the Secretary of the Interior should state. That was the compromise and that is the bill of the conferees.

Now, that is dealing with developed wells. Of course, it was necessary to deal with the discovery of new oil fields. The real object of this bill is to open up other oil fields. I want to say to the Senate to-day that unless other oil fields are opened up and discovered in this country we will not have sufficient oil to supply our domestic needs and our Navy and our proposed fleet. I want to say to the Senate to-day that unless there are some oil fields discovered, the natural resources consisting of oil will be a thing almost of the past in 10 years from now.

The chief object of this bill was to discover down under the earth new oil fields that we might break the existing monopoly and that we might enrich the resources of this country. In that the House bill and the Senate bill differed. The Senate bill provided that there might be 2,560 acres of public land set aside for prospecting purposes if it was over 10 miles from an existing oil well, and 640 acres if it was within 10 miles. The House bill provided that it should be 64 acres. We compromised upon 1,280 acres as to the prospecting area.

The House bill provided for a preferential right to lease the whole area within the permit if oil is discovered. The Senate bill provided for a patent to one-fourth of the land in the permit area, with a preferential right to lease the balance of the area. They agreed finally that to grant a patent to one-fourth of the area, as provided in the Senate bill, would protect the poor prospector against the greed of the promoter better than the House bill, and we adopted it.

Every provision against dummy locators and fraud contained in the House bill, which was approved by the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior and the Attorney General, was incorporated in this bill.

Men, in fact, a man who is not a Member of either this body or the House of Representatives, who occasionally casts his eye over legislation, who knows nothing about this legislation, has said that the House bill was all right, but the Senate bill was bad, and he wrote letters to public men before the conference report was made. The conference report adopted every provision against fraud that was in the House bill. The only provision that they did not adopt was to declare that that man himself was a fraud.

Now, what is there about the bill that you do not like? For six years we have tried to open up all these lands. We have met with the House three times to try to agree on a bill. We finally agreed on a leasing bill, nothing but a leasing bill, as far as oil was concerned, absolutely within the discretion of the Government. Every discoverer of oil is totally at the mercy of the Government. We agreed on a leasing bill whereby those who have made these great rich naval reserves give up everything except the right to take the oil out of the wells they have sunk and pay the Government such royalty as the Government may take.

We have agreed on a bill as far as the naval reserves are concerned that was drawn by the Navy Department. We have agreed on a bill as far as the fraud terms are concerned that was approved by the Attorney General. We have agreed on a bill that takes everything away from the man who risked his all to find an oil well except the bare opportunity of getting his money back.

Is there any use in arguing this question any further? The conference report was printed in the RECORD days ago so that people could read it and understand it. We have done the best we could in six years. We have done the best we could since May to get together on some kind of a bill and open up these lands. We have worked conscientiously and hard on it, and nine men have agreed on this bill. The five men from the House were intense advocates of the leasing system, intense advocates of Government monopolization of these resources, and when they agreed to it, when they staked their reputation on it, when the House on a fight, on a debate, voted 322 to 109, can there be any question about the sincerity of this thing?

I do not know what more to say. Anyone can kill this report by talking. We all know that. I do not think there is any such intention. We are right here in a jam at the end of the session

when the appropriation bills are crowding on us. I should like to go further into it. I will answer questions that may be asked of me, but I refrain from going further into it because I believe everybody wants a fair, square vote on the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PITTMAN. I do.

Mr. LENROOT. I called the Senator's attention a little while ago to section 3 of both the Senate and House bills excluding Alaska. I wish to say that I have since discovered that section 29 of the House bill does refer to Alaska in certain cases of leasing. It is only fair to call the Senator's attention to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I refused to sign this conference report. Having done so I think it no more than right that I should call the attention of the Senate to some of the reasons for my refusal.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] says this bill has passed the Senate three times and the House three times. Mr. President, a bill has passed the Senate three times and a bill has passed the House three times, but the bill as reported in this conference report never passed the House until the conference report was adopted by it the other day and it has never passed the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Before the Senator takes his seat I should like to ask him to indicate clearly the portions of the conference report which were never considered by the House or by the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I will come to that before I get through with my remarks.

It is true, Mr. President, that there is a provision in the bill as reported by the conference for leasing and for selling coal lands in the United States under certain conditions, but as far as the sale of coal lands under this bill is concerned there is no material difference from existing law. There is a difference from the wording of the law, but the result will be no change whatever.

In order that I may be perfectly fair in this matter and in order that the Senate may know just what I mean I want to read that part of the report relating to this matter. It will be found, beginning on page 2 of the bill, section 2, under the heading of coal. It reads:

That any citizen or any association composed of persons severally qualified by law to enter coal lands, or any corporation incorporated under and by virtue of the laws of any State or Territory, or any municipality of any State or Territory, shall, upon application to the register of the proper land office, have the right to enter by legal subdivisions any quantity of vacant coal lands of the United States within any State or Territory of the Union not otherwise appropriated by competent authority, not exceeding 2,560 acres, upon payment to the receiver of not less than \$10 per acre for such lands where the same shall be situated more than 15 miles from any completed railroad, and not less than \$20 per acre for such lands as shall be within 15 miles of such railroad, and the Secretary of the Interior shall offer such coal lands and award the same through advertisement and competitive bidding, reserving the right to reject any and all bids which he may deem to be unfair.

Mr. President, to-day the Secretary of the Interior, through the Geological Survey, has made an examination of all coal lands withdrawn from entry, and if the examination is not made at the time a citizen of the United States desires to enter coal land, a request is made for an examination for the purpose of determining the value per acre of said land. When the Geological Survey makes a report upon the value of the land, then if the entryman desires to purchase at the valuation reported by the Geological Survey he has a right, or he and his associates, to enter 640 acres of coal land and purchase the same, provided the price per acre is agreed upon. But it is not mandatory upon the Secretary of the Interior that the price fixed by the Geological Survey shall be paid for the coal land. As I stated to the Senator from Nevada, I know of compromises that have been made and the lands have been purchased.

Mr. President, we do not want to deceive ourselves in relation to this provision. It simply means that if the Secretary of the Interior does not want to sell any coal lands in the United States they are not going to be sold any more than they are to-day.

The Senator from Nevada says that the reason for the sale provision is that there is a surplus of coal lands in the United States of 44,000,000 acres, and that without the sale provision the present coal operators in the United States will have a monopoly of the production and sale of coal to the consumers in all parts of the United States. Mr. President, there is no difference to-day in the sale of coal lands in the United States from those in existence 10 years ago. I remember 10 years ago it was stated upon the floor of the Senate that in 28 years every pound of coal in the United States would be exhausted; and now we are

told that every gallon of oil in the United States will be exhausted in 10 years.

There are coal fields and there are oil fields undiscovered in all parts of the United States, I have no doubt. Doubtless there is enough coal in the State of Utah alone to furnish the United States all the coal that will be needed for 100 years to come.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will allow me, I will state that the Geological Survey has stated that there are in the public lands of the State of Colorado 371,000,000 tons of coal—enough to supply the entire world at the present rate of consumption for 300 years—and Wyoming has even more than has Colorado.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, what the Senator from Colorado has stated is true. I do not know whether Colorado has a larger quantity of coal than has the State of Utah, but I rather think it has. However, when the statements were made that we should not have coal enough to last the United States for 28 years—and those statements were made 12 years ago—

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I will yield to the Senator as soon as I finish this sentence.

Twelve years ago the same department of the Government which submitted figures to Congress and to the people of the United States to prove that statement beyond a doubt now says there is enough coal in the State of Colorado alone to last the United States for 300 or 400 years.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That there is enough to last the entire world for that length of time.

Mr. THOMAS. We shall not have an opportunity to develop our coal lands for a thousand years under the operation of existing laws.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I desire to ask the Senator from Utah if he would favor the Senate with the name of that prophet?

Mr. SMOOT. There was more than one; there were several prophets. That prophecy was sent from one end of this country to the other. In fact, I know of people in the United States who were alarmed and who began to wonder how their children who were born in the future would be kept warm.

Why, Senators will remember when the coal-leasing bill for Alaska was before this body. I admit that I voted for that bill, but in voting for it I said at the time that perhaps it was just as well to try out this system "upon the poor people of Alaska" before entering upon it in the United States. Now, we have a letter, which has been read from the Secretary's desk, signed by the Secretary of the Interior, admitting that the lease system is a failure and asking that Alaska be included in this bill. Mr. President, if it is a failure now, it will be a failure under this bill.

The sale-of-coal provision under this bill does not amount to a pinch of snuff as far as changing existing conditions. The Senator from Montana made this chamber ring with his declarations that there were men then in the District, at the very time that we had the bill under consideration, with millions of dollars to open up the coal fields of Alaska; that, if we would only pass the legislation, he knew of men praying daily for its passage so that they could send their money to Alaska and relieve the stricken people of the troubles and the trials that they were laboring under because of the lack of coal.

It was reported at the time that coal was within a few hundred feet of the homes of people in Alaska; but the people could not take a bucket full of coal that was actually in sight—not a thousand tons or a million tons, but hundreds of millions of tons—and yet not a bucket full of it could be used by the freezing people of Alaska.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I received, and I suppose perhaps the Senator himself did, a communication from one of the commercial bodies in an Alaskan city—I forget the name of it, but it is the terminus of the railroad—

Mr. SMOOT. At Cordova, I think.

Mr. THOMAS. At Cordova, announcing that the coal consumed by the people there was obtained from the Dominion of Canada, and requesting that the laws be so amended as that people could dig their own coal from veins in their own territory.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I received a copy of the same resolution to which the Senator from Colorado has referred, and I suppose most other Senators did.

When the Alaska leasing bill was before the Senate it was stated that coal was selling in Alaska for \$28 a ton, much of it

being shipped from the Dominion of Canada and some from as far as the coal fields of Pennsylvania and West Virginia. Upon those statements and knowing, as we thought we did, after the Senator from Montana had stated it time and again, that there were men anxious to put in millions of dollars to relieve that unbearable situation in far-off Alaska, we passed the bill.

What has been the result? The Secretary of the Interior says that there have been four leases made in Alaska since the passage of that law; two of them have never been operated, and the other two leases have been operated so slightly it could hardly be termed the working of a coal mine.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to say to the Senator that it is also reported—how true it is I do not know—by persons in Alaska who claim to know the situation that the properties which have been leased really command the key to the situation in each of the coal fields.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I feel sure they do; but so far as the working of them is concerned, it has not amounted to much.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator if he knows whether the failure of the Alaskan coal-leasing law is due to the law itself or to the drastic regulations made under it by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. SMOOT. The only way to answer that question is by saying that both the law itself and the unworkable regulations of the department have contributed to the result; and, Mr. President, if this bill becomes a law, I say now that the regulations, which will be written by some clerk in the department, will be such that they will hamper the production of coal wherever mined. The production of coal, where the land is owned by private parties who are operating it to-day, will not have such handicap, so how can any individual or any company undertake at this time to develop coal hampered by restrictions with which his competitor is not obliged to conform and pay a royalty upon every ton produced when his competitor and neighbor is not compelled to pay a royalty?

During times such as we have had for the last two or three years, while the world war has been going on, even the unfavorably situated coal mines of the country have made money. It has not been a question of the price of coal so much as it has been a question of securing production; and the price that has been fixed upon coal to be paid by the people of the United States during these years has not been fixed upon the basis of what the coal could be produced for by those most advantageously situated, but the price has been fixed upon the coal in this country which cost the most to be produced. That was necessarily so. If that had not been the case we could not have produced sufficient coal for family consumption and for commercial and industrial needs of all kinds.

Mr. President, I remember very well when the leasing system was first talked of in the United States. I was positive at that time that if the policy were proposed and there was opposition to it the domain of the Western States would be withdrawn and withheld from development until the people of those States yielded to a leasing system as demanded by the heads of some of the bureaus of the Interior Department. I was told that that would be the policy if it took 20 years to bring it about; and that was 12 years ago.

I remember the late Senator Newlands appearing before the Public Lands Committee not once, not twice, not three times, but, I believe, since I have been a member of the Committee on Public Lands in the Senate—and that has been for nearly 16 years—he appeared dozens of times, and always took the position that the leasing system desired was not for the purpose of making a profit. It was wanted in order to conserve the coal of the country, in order that we may see to it that the mining of coal is carried on in such a way that there shall be no waste, because, unless coal was conserved, our country will be without coal in less than 28 years. All he wanted was a royalty sufficient to pay the examiners who would be sent from the Interior Department to see that the miner used his pick just as some little \$1,200 department clerk thought he ought to use it; to tell miners who had done nothing all their lives but mine coal how to mine it; to pay employees in the department to keep a record of all production brought about through the passage of the proposed leasing law. If this legislation becomes a law, it may be depended upon that we will have another bureau in this Government, employing not 10, not 20, not 100 men, but we will have them traveling by the hundreds in every section of the country.

Mr. President, when this bill passed the Senate it provided that one half of the royalties collected upon the production of coal, the phosphate, the sodium, the oil, the gas, or any of the products named in the bill should go to the States in which the

oil or coal or sodium or phosphate was produced. It was to go to the maintenance of the schools and the building of roads in the States in which the products were produced. The other half was to go to the reclamation fund for the purpose of constructing reclamation projects in States in which arid lands are located, so that lands worthless to-day could be made profitable and help raise grain and food sufficient to feed the people of the United States and the needy of the world, if necessary. What do we find in this report? That provision has been modified and a sop held out to the people of the different States in the way of a provision that all the money so derived shall go to the reclamation fund, to be expended for reclamation purposes, and at some time in the future, perhaps when our grandchildren's heads are as white as snow, this fund may leak back into the States, to be used for the purpose provided in the bill as it passed the Senate.

Sensors, is it right to withdraw up to 50, 60, 70, 80 per cent of the area of a State and not allow the State to impose a dollar of taxation upon same, thus saying that not an acre of such land shall pay a cent of taxes to the maintenance of the institutions of the State; and in case there is discovered coal, oil, sodium, phosphate within the borders of the State, the same shall not be developed or utilized; the same as these very products have been done in all the States, with exception of the public-land States? Not one dollar shall go to the educating of the children of those sparsely populated States. Not a dollar of it shall go to the building of roads, in order that the people of those States may enjoy at least moderately good roads to carry the products of the farm to local markets.

Mr. President, what would the great State of New York or Pennsylvania say, or what would the great State of Ohio or Illinois say, if they had 80 per cent of all their area withdrawn and if the Government placed its hand over it, saying that no man shall enter such withdrawn land unless under a leasing system? Not only that, but the Government prevents the collection of one cent of taxes from said land. Do you think such a condition would be allowed long? It is unthinkable; it is unbearable; and it is a monument to the loyalty of the people of the West that they have not rebelled against it in the past. Now, Mr. President, if this system is adopted we will never get rid of it. That burden is to be placed upon the people of the West, to carry as long as we live there. It is wrong; it can not be defended; and the day will come when there will be a change, but it will take a long time, no doubt.

The Secretary of the Interior to-day admits that the whole leasing system in Alaska was wrong; that it has been a failure; and I predict now that the same system of leasing of the public lands of the United States will be a failure.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, if it should turn out to be a failure, we would be in no worse condition than now, would we? And if it is demonstrated that it is a failure, the result would be that other legislation would be enacted in order to give development.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator who has just interrupted me has stood upon this floor for years past, and I have listened to his voice ring out as the clarion notes of a man who was absolutely convinced in his soul that he was doing his people a service and standing up for their rights by asserting that the leasing system is anything but American in principle.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I agree to that now.

Mr. SMOOT. If I felt the same as the Senator has said he felt time and time again upon this floor, I would never change my attitude on the demand of the head of any department. I say that you can not compromise with that which is right at any time. If it is right, it is right; if it is wrong, it is wrong; and the Senator knows that that is the case, not only with individuals but with nations as well.

I recognize the truth of the old saying that a lie can travel around the world while truth is putting on its boots; but finally the time will come when truth overtakes the lie, when the right overtakes the wrong. In the great plans of the Jehovah it has been decreed that ultimately right will prevail.

Mr. President, I would prefer to say to my people: "Bear your burdens a little longer; there is help coming." I have not any doubt but that we could pass through the Senate of the United States to-day a bill giving to the States of the Union all the public lands in the States. I doubt very much whether such a bill could pass the House, but the sentiment in favor of it is growing, and when the people of the United States understand what the people of the West have passed through for the last 15 or 20 years I have too much confidence in the good judgment and absolute justice of the American people to think for a minute that they will not rectify the wrongs done.

Mr. President, the royalties to be collected in the first place, as I stated, were to be just sufficient to pay the expenses of ad-

ministering the law. Have we not been here long enough to learn that whenever there has been created in the Government of the United States a division or a bureau every dollar that they can put their hands on in any way goes to the enlargement of the powers and the increasing of the employees within that bureau or division? I could stand here and recite case after case showing this to be absolutely true. I know that there have been statements made upon the floor of the Senate, when a new bureau was to be created, that at no time in all the history of the country would it require more than \$25,000 a year. It would be started with an appropriation of \$10,000, and we find those bureaus growing every year, and some of them are now asking for appropriations of about \$1,000,000 a year. Some of them last year, because Congress would not appropriate all they asked for, went to the President of the United States for money, and he gave them from the \$100,000,000 fund that was given him to carry on this war \$100,000, \$150,000, \$200,000 in some cases. The amounts advanced had no more to do with carrying on this war than if I had given \$10 to some poor person out in the Western States to keep cold and hunger away from him.

In the Senate bill it was provided that there should be a minimum royalty charged, and we also provided that there should be a maximum royalty charged. If there is one thing that has been brought forcibly to the attention of the Senate whenever the leasing system has been brought forth, it is that under such provision it is impossible to secure money for the development of new properties. I know that the laws generally say "under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior"; but the Senate decided that there should be a minimum royalty of one-eighth, or 12½ per cent, upon all the oil or coal produced, and they also provided that under no conditions should there be more than a certain percentage charged as royalties. Under this conference report we still maintain the minimum charge, but the maximum-charge provision is eliminated.

In other words, if a man desires to improve or develop an oil well or a coal field, he goes to his banker and asks for assistance; and I want to say to you that the men who undertake such a project are generally men who have not the means to develop it. They have to borrow the money to do it. The banker says, "What title have you to this land?" "None whatever." "Is there any chance for you to get title to it?" "None whatever." "Under what conditions are you going to develop it or work it?" "Well, there was a law passed imposing a minimum rate of royalty of one-eighth." The banker would say, "What about the maximum royalty?" "Oh, there was no maximum royalty fixed. The conference took that out." "Do you mean to say that the Secretary of the Interior can say to you that your maximum royalty shall be 50 or 60 or 70 per cent?" "There is nothing in the law to prevent it." "Well, I do not believe we want to risk any money upon any such proposition."

Mr. President, that has been the case in revocable permits that have been granted by the Department of the Interior for years in the development of water powers. Who will advance money for the development of a water power with a revocable permit, under which some \$1,200 clerk in the department can go out and tell the man who is developing that power, and putting all he has and all that he can get from his friends into it, that he has violated some provision or regulation of the department, and therefore might lose all that he has?

Mr. President, I had hoped that when a leasing bill came into this body or when the conference report was to be adopted it would be a workable proposition. I want also to admit my humiliation, as one of the conferees. I never expected to see conferees sit around a table and agree among themselves to a provision for certain sections of a bill and then have it suggested that some member of the conference take it down to the Secretary of the Interior and see if he would approve it. I never expected to have another conferee sent to another department, and another conferee sent to still another one, asking the heads of these departments of the Government to please approve of what the conferees had agreed to. Is it any wonder that the people are losing confidence in the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, their representatives who are sent here to represent them?

What I think ought to be done is for the conferees to agree upon the differences between the two Houses, and if Congress approves of the action of the conferees, let it go to the President of the United States, and if his Cabinet members do not approve of the action of Congress let him veto it, as he could any other proposed law. I would not spend the time in cabling to Paris to find out whether the President was in favor of a certain proposition or not. The President of the United

States is not the legislative body. That duty devolves upon us and not upon the members of the Cabinet or the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I am getting tired of having men from all the departments interested in legislation haunting the offices of Senators morning, noon, and night, begging them to support pending legislation. I had an experience this morning by being informed by a delegation that if I did not vote for a certain proposition all the organizations of my State would be notified and that my election would be put in jeopardy. Mr. President, I did not spend any time with that delegation. I told them that whenever the people of Utah tired of my actions on legislative matters that affect the country and the State which I in part represent, they would defeat me.

But I do not propose, Mr. President, to stand here as a Senator of the United States and not only have the heads of departments but the employees of the departments interested in legislation that affects them personally dictate to me how I am going to vote on any question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 14078) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. PITTMAN. I will ask the Senator from Alabama if he will agree to temporarily lay aside the appropriation bill for a little while and see whether we can not dispose of the conference report.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator if I had any assurance that the conference report could be disposed of in half an hour, or an hour, or something like that, I would very willingly agree to lay the appropriation bill aside, but without an assurance of that kind I do not feel justified in laying the supply bill aside for what may be a long debate.

Mr. PITTMAN. I will say to the Senator, of course, I could not give him that assurance. I do not know. There are Senators here who desire to speak on it, but I think possibly they might be willing to have a vote within half an hour.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator can give assurance that we can get a vote in half an hour I am willing to lay the bill temporarily aside, but I do not think I would be justified in laying it aside for a longer time than that.

Mr. PITTMAN. I will say to the Senator that I have no intimation that any Senator desires to kill the conference report by talking upon it.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that it will take me at least half an hour to complete my remarks.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand some other Senators desire to discuss the conference report. They have so informed me. I think it would take several hours, and under those circumstances I would not be justified in laying the supply bill aside.

Mr. PITTMAN. I would ask the Senator to at least agree to temporarily lay it aside until the Senator from Utah can finish his very interesting speech on this subject.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to accommodate the Senator from Utah, but I do not know how long he would take, and it would simply delay the supply bill. The conference report is not going to come to a final conclusion, I am sure, to-day.

Mr. PITTMAN. I can not possibly believe that the Senator from Utah would talk solely for the purpose of killing the bill. I think possibly his intention is to enlighten us on the subject. If it is, I should dislike very much to see him discontinue his argument all at once.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want to disappoint the Senator from Nevada. I noticed that he was out of the Chamber nearly all the time I was speaking, and I do not think he was very much interested in what I said. Perhaps to-morrow, if the report comes up, he will give me his attention. I assure the Senator I will appreciate it very greatly.

Mr. PITTMAN. I have heard the Senator speak so often before I thought he was really speaking for the benefit of the country, and knowing how much they will enjoy it, and knowing how much the western people in particular will enjoy his speech, I wanted him to go on.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator has made his speech so often that he thinks every other Senator is making the same speech.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14078) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Govern-

ment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Alabama, who has charge of the pending appropriation bill, whether he intends to insist on continuing our session until some hour in the evening, as was agreed upon by the Democratic caucus some time ago?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think it is absolutely necessary that these supply bills should be passed, at least as many of them as possible. This bill has not got very much that is disputed in it. It carries the salaries for all the great departments, and it ought to be disposed of by the Senate at an early hour. If we can not get through with the bill by a reasonable hour this afternoon, and the Senate will sustain me in it, I am willing to stay here for a night session. Of course, that depends upon whether my colleagues will stay here and furnish the quorum. I can not do it myself.

Mr. THOMAS. I have advocated night sessions since the beginning of this year, because I have felt that without them we would be unable to transact the business on the calendar. The majority so determined formally some time ago, but our determination or conclusion seems to have been honored more in the breach than in the observance. I know we can not get through with the business before us unless we hold night sessions, and having so determined, I, for one, shall insist that the Senate remain in session for a reasonable period after the usual time of adjournment, in order that we may at least make the effort to get rid of the business, or some of it, before us.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that I am in thorough accord with what he says, but I can not control the situation without a quorum here. I believe this bill can be disposed of, if the Senate devotes its time entirely to it, between now and 7 o'clock to-night. If we can do that, I am willing to take an adjournment at that time.

Mr. THOMAS. I think if the Senate finishes the bill by that time—and I hope it will—we then should take up another bill at 7 o'clock and see if we can not dispose of it between that hour and 10 at least.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In that event, of course, the control of the situation passes out of my hands and will rest in the hands of the Senator who calls up the next bill. As far as this bill is concerned, if we are not through with it at a reasonable hour this evening, I shall ask the Senate to stay here for a night session. If I can get a quorum I will stay and try to finish the bill; but if it is impossible to get a quorum nothing will be done except to adjourn. In the meantime I hope the Senate will this afternoon allow us to consider the bill to the exclusion of all other business.

Mr. SMOOT. I am of the same opinion. There are a number of Senators absent who are interested in the bill, and I think time will be saved by suggesting the absence of a quorum. We will get them here and then proceed with the bill. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---------------|----------------|------------|--------------|
| Baird | Hitchcock | Moses | Smith, Ariz. |
| Beckham | Jones, N. Mex. | Nelson | Smoot |
| Brandegee | Jones, Wash. | New | Spencer |
| Calder | Kellogg | Norris | Sterling |
| Culberson | Kendrick | Nugent | Sutherland |
| Cummins | Kenyon | Owen | Swanson |
| Curtis | King | Page | Thomas |
| Dillingham | Kirby | Pittman | Thompson |
| Fletcher | Knox | Poindexter | Townsend |
| France | La Follette | Pomerene | Trammell |
| Frelinghuysen | Lenroot | Ransdell | Underwood |
| Gay | Lewis | Reed | Walsh |
| Gronna | McCumber | Saulsbury | Warren |
| Hale | McKellar | Shafroth | Weeks |
| Harding | McLean | Sheppard | Williams |
| Hardwick | McNary | Sherman | Wolcott |
| Henderson | Martin, Ky. | Simmons | |

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GAY in the chair). Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill at line 20, page 44, and read to line 2, page 50, the last paragraph read being as follows:

For compensation, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, of such number of employees as may be necessary to audit the accounts and vouchers of the Postal Service, \$481,700.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if that is the usual provision in the legislative appropriation bill, carrying \$481,700 in a lump sum for the payment of employees to audit the account and vouchers of the Postal Service. Is that a permanent or usual provision?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the Money Order Division of the Post Office Department.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have heard a great deal of complaint about that division since I have been here.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There has been complaint. War conditions have affected it very greatly.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did not hear of any complaint during the war; it was prior to that time when I heard the complaint.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the war conditions have affected the volume of the work.

Mr. JONES of Washington. And increased the amount of the item?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Very much.

Mr. SMOOT. Last year there was appropriated for this purpose \$297,130. That has been increased to \$481,700.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Can the Senator tell me why it is necessary to carry that in a lump sum, and why we do not provide for regular salaried positions?

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator is perfectly right in suggesting such a course, although the excuse given for it is that the changes are made very rapidly, that they are not working continually; and they feel that they can employ the necessary people through a lump sum at a cheaper rate to the Government than by having salaries fixed. I do not agree with that proposition. I think the employees ought to be provided for this work just the same as for the other work in the office of the Auditor for the Post Office Department.

Mr. JONES of Washington. This is a permanent division, is it not?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; and not only that, but this is a permanent appropriation. It has been going on for many, many years, and it has increased as time goes on.

Mr. JONES of Washington. They do not employ the workers here for a short time and then dismiss them for a while and then reemploy them?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will allow me, I understand that a great deal of it is piecemeal, and that is the reason why they want this latitude in a general appropriation. But all appropriations of this kind, and there are a number of them, might be improved by a fixed salary. I am in thorough accord with what the Senator says about lump-sum appropriations, but it would be impossible for the Committee on Appropriations, in the time allowed after the bill comes to the Senate, to take up and investigate all those propositions. However, this bill carries in it a proposal for a commission to reorganize all this work. That is the only way by which it can be done. It is impossible for the committee to do it, and I hope the proposal will be adopted, and that it will result in remedying the trouble the Senator complains of.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the Senator is perfectly right in that. We have corrected from time to time some of the lump-sum provisions by fixing salaries of employees, but I can see how, with a large force like this, it would be very difficult to do it. I think probably the commission which is provided in the bill, if it is enacted into law, will take care of many of these cases and correct what I really think are abuses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will resume the reading of the bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Before going further, I desire to give notice that when the bill gets into the Senate I shall reserve the right for a separate vote upon the Senate committee amendments referring to the Department of State that have already been agreed to as in Committee of the Whole.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 53, line 5, after the word "Commissioner," to strike out "\$6,500" and insert "\$10,000" and in line 17, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$687,870" and insert "\$691,370," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Commissioner of Internal Revenue: Commissioner, \$10,000; deputy commissioners—2 at \$4,000 each, 1 \$3,600; chemists—chief \$3,000, 1 2,500; assistant chemists—2 at \$1,800 each, 1 \$1,600, 1 \$1,400; heads of divisions—1 \$3,500, 5 at \$2,500 each, 5 at \$2,250 each; 3 assistant heads of divisions, at \$2,000 each; attorney, \$3,600; law clerk, \$2,000; insurance expert, \$2,000; railroad expert, \$2,000; superintendent of stamp vault, \$2,000; private secretary, \$1,800; clerks—4 at \$2,000 each, 52 of class 4, 60 of class 3, 98 of class 2, 83 of class 1, 76 at \$1,000 each, 73 at \$900 each; 11 messengers; 21 assistant messengers; 16 laborers; in all, \$691,370.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to the end of line 14, on page 54.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether the provision on page 54, from line 10 to line 14, is intended to be a limitation on the amount of money that can be expended in connection with the construction and repair of Coast Guard cutters to \$6,800, or whether it is a limitation upon the amount that can be paid for draftsmen?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator from Washington that this item refers to the employment of skilled draftsmen who receive higher pay than other employees under this provision, and the House limited the amount that could be spent for these particular draftsmen. They increased it \$1,500, and I think they gave consideration to the amount that was needed for that purpose. They did not want the general limitation to run into the full appropriation. That is the whole object of that language.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Are these draftsmen permanent employees or merely temporary employees?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My understanding is that there is a force which is permanent, but that not all of them are permanent. I think their employment only continues so long as the work lasts. On the other hand, I think there is work of this kind being done all the time.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Alabama will notice that there is a provision on page 53, line 25, for the employment of a draftsman regularly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; and these draftsmen are in addition to that one.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senate made no change in this particular, and in the House hearings on the legislative bill, on page 380, the item is explained. Mr. BYRNS of the House committee asked the question:

Mr. BYRNS. You are asking for an increase in the authorization for services of skilled draftsmen from \$5,000 to \$6,800.

Commodore BERTHOLF. Yes, sir; that is to permit us to get more skilled services along that line. We do not ask for an increase in the appropriation, but for authority to expend that portion of the appropriation for these services.

Mr. BYRNS. Your note states that you now have two draftsmen at \$2,400 each per annum.

Commodore BERTHOLF. Yes, sir; they are draftsmen, which is a general term. They do work in connection with ship designing and construction work. We must have some more assistance of that kind, and that is why we ask that the sum available for this assistance be increased. We can not get anybody for \$1,000 or \$1,500.

I think that explains the reason for this language.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I see that in line 25, page 53, provision is made for a draftsman at \$1,500; but he seems to be the only draftsman whom we provide for the Coast Guards; and, as I recollect what the Senator from Alabama read, there are two draftsmen who are paid \$2,400 a year each. What does this \$1,500 draftsman do?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I must say I do not know; I am not informed, outside of the testimony which I have just read; but I presume that he does drafting work, but probably he is not as high a class man as are those who are paid the higher salaries. That is, however, entirely a supposition on my part, for the question has not heretofore been raised.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It seems to me as though the man for whose employment it provides permanently ought to be a good man. Of course, that is a matter which probably will be taken care of by this commission; but I think it is a matter that ought to be looked into.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is no question in the world that these salaries have grown up for the last 50 years in such a manner that they are out of line. It is impossible for an appropriation committee to straighten them out, and I think that, if we get the proper commission appointed, we may reform the situation very materially.

The reading of the bill was resumed, beginning at line 15, page 54.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 55, line 3, before the word "watchman," to strike out "seventy-five," and insert "eighty"; and, in line 7, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$285,310," and insert "\$288,910," so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Engraving and Printing: Director, \$6,000; assistant director, \$3,500; chief of division of assignments and reviews, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; disbursing agent, \$2,400; cost accountant, \$2,000; medical and sanitary officer, \$2,250; stenographer, \$1,800; storekeeper, \$1,600; assistant storekeeper, \$1,000; clerk in charge of purchases and supplies, \$2,000; clerks—2 of class 4, 8 of class 3, 14 of class 2, 12 of class 1, 12 at \$1,000 each, 15 at \$900 each, 15 at \$840 each, 3 at \$780 each; 9 attendants, at \$600 each; helpers—1 at \$900, 2 at \$720 each, 2 at \$600 each; 3 messengers; 7 assistant messengers; captain of watch, \$1,400; 2 lieutenants of watch, at \$900 each; 80 watchmen; 2 forewomen of charwomen, at \$540 each; 35 day charwomen, at \$400 each; 94 morning and evening charwomen, at \$300

each; foreman of laborers, \$900; 4 laborers; 85 laborers, at \$540 each; in all, \$288,910; and no other fund appropriated by this or any other act shall be used for services, in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, of the character specified in this paragraph, except in cases of emergency arising after the passage of this act, and then only on the written approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and in every such case of emergency a detailed statement of the expenditures on account thereof shall be reported to Congress at the beginning of each regular session.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Alabama if the language in line 19, page 55, expresses the purpose intended?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In what way?

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do the words "one, one thousand," mean.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That means one clerk of class 3, which is a specific designation of a higher-class clerk; I think one receiving \$1,800; he is a statutory clerk. If the Senator from Texas will refer to the back of the bill, he will see what salaries are carried.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What word is supposed to come after the word "one," between "one" and "\$1,000"—"one clerk"?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Nothing is supposed to come between those two words. The clerks provided for before that are statutory clerks. When we say "two clerks of class 4," that means two clerks at \$1,800 each; one clerk of class 3 means one clerk at \$1,600; but there is no statutory designation for a clerk at a thousand dollars, so he is designated as a clerk at \$1,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then would it not be better to have the word "clerk" appear after the word "one," so as to read "one clerk, \$1,000"?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will look at the language in line 18 he will find it reads "clerks," and a dash, which makes the word "clerks" apply to every other clerk following. It is the same as if it read:

Two clerks of class 4, one clerk of class 3, and one clerk at a thousand dollars.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see the connection now, Mr. President.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of line 26, page 55.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask the Senator from Alabama a question. In line 25 on page 55 there is a provision for a messenger and an assistant messenger, without any compensation named for either. I presume that they both get the same.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They are statutory positions; and if the Senator will refer to the back of the bill he will find the provision for the salaries of assistant messengers.

Mr. JONES of Washington. What especially attracted my attention was the designation "assistant messenger." I had not noticed that expression before.

Mr. WARREN. It is the regular designation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will refer to page 151, section 2, he will see that it designates the statutory pay for this class of work; and where this particular language, "messenger and assistant messenger," is used, they are carried in the bill according to the terms of payment fixed in section 2, page 151.

Mr. JONES of Washington. What does the messenger get?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. A messenger gets \$840 and an assistant messenger \$720; of course, with the bonus added.

Mr. JONES of Washington. In connection with the messenger and assistant messenger, I wish to ask the Senator what is the difference in the duties of a messenger and an assistant messenger?

Mr. THOMAS. The assistant messenger does the work.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator that he has asked a question that is beyond my ken. I have sometimes gone into a department and found a \$1,200 clerk practically running the office and the \$1,800 clerks reading the newspapers. The assistant messenger may be the real man on the job or he may be an attendant; I can not tell the Senator. He will have to designate the job and give me an opportunity to go down and make a personal investigation before I can answer that question.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It does not seem to me that we ought to have classifications of "messenger" and "assistant messenger." It looks like the assistant messenger is to assist the messenger, and surely that is not intended.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There are some bureaus and some divisions where they need more than one messenger, or think they need more than one messenger, and so they have two.

Mr. THOMAS. A messenger is apt to get tired sometimes and to need a little assistance.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The provision for the two classes leaves an opportunity for promotion for good work and holds out to the second man the inducement that if he runs far and fast, he may get a higher salary some day.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think that is a very good place for the commission proposed in this bill to begin some work.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the statement just made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is about the only excuse I have ever heard for the designation "assistant messenger." They do the same identical work in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred as messengers. It is true that sometimes a messenger has a number of assistant messengers under him, but, in the great majority of cases at least, they do the same work. The only difference is that the assistant messenger begins at a lower salary, and, as the Senator from Alabama says, if he does that work well and steps along fast enough he may receive an appointment as messenger.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to ask the Senator if these assistant messengers are under orders from the messengers?

Mr. SMOOT. At times, yes, if there is more than one; but they do not take orders very well, I will say.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not know that I blame them very much. I think it is just a provision to give one man authority over another and make that an excuse for giving him a little bit more pay.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I think that is hardly a just statement. There is the same promotion from assistant messenger to messenger as there is between a clerk of class 1 and a clerk of class 2. We do not give any particular authority to a clerk of class 2 to give orders to a clerk of class 1. Of course they are under the direction of whoever may be at the head of the division; but these messengers are appointed as young men, and, as has been stated, if they do well, they can be promoted so that they get the salary of messengers. It might be said that the same kind of discrimination exists in the case of messenger and assistant messenger as exists between a clerk of class 2 and a clerk of class 1, or between a clerk of class 2 and a clerk of class 3.

Mr. JONES of Washington. A messenger is supposed to be one who runs errands from one place to another.

Mr. WARREN. Not entirely. You will find in some of the divisions a messenger opening the mail in the morning. He has been there long enough and is sufficiently accustomed to the work to open the mail and divide it so that it may go to the different rooms. He has been instructed how to do that work; while the assistant messenger will be on the door to wait on the people coming in and going out, waiting on Senators and Representatives who come to the door, and so forth.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It takes him, I presume, a good while to secure a promotion to a position where he opens the letters?

Mr. WARREN. Why does the Senator say that?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Because we provide for these places annual salaries, and I take it that these men are not promoted very much throughout the year.

Mr. WARREN. Vacancies occur all the time in the place of messenger, as they occur in other positions, so that there is always a potential opportunity for promotion.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Probably there are more vacancies in the position of assistant messenger than there are in that of messenger.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 56, line 15, after the words "Surgeon General," to strike out "\$1,800" and insert "\$2,000," and in line 22, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$92,770" and insert "\$92,970," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Surgeon General of Public Health Service: Chief clerk, \$2,250; private secretary to the Surgeon General, \$2,000; principal bookkeeper, \$2,000; statistician, \$2,000; technical assistant, \$2,000; assistant editor, \$1,800; librarian, \$1,600; clerks—5 of class 4, 6 of class 3, 15 of class 2 (one of whom shall be translator), 19 of class 1, 6 at \$1,030 each, 3 at \$900 each; elevator conductor, \$840; 3 messengers; 3 assistant messengers; telephone operator, \$720; 3 laborers; in all, \$92,970.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, my recollection is that that amendment was opposed by me in the committee, and I reserved the right to oppose it on the floor of the Senate. I do not think that we ought to grant the increase of \$200 in this case. We have not followed the policy of increasing salaries in this bill. We have picked out very few; in fact I think this is about the only one that the committee has raised. I do not remember any others. This man may be entitled to an increase of salary, but there are probably a great many others in this bill who could make just as strong a showing. This em-

ployee will get the benefit of the \$240 bonus that is provided generally for the clerks. I hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment and single this man out for special consideration.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, the reason the committee agreed to this amendment was that Surg. Gen. Blue came before the committee and represented that the gentleman who holds this place has held it for a number of years; that he not only occupies the position of private and confidential secretary, but, as very often occurs in such positions, he is responsible for a large amount of the routine work of the office which comes under his authority. Eighteen hundred dollars is below the amount which, upon the average, is paid for men of this class; it is below the average that we pay for the work done by our own private secretaries; and the showing was such that the committee concluded that this was an exceptional case.

I will read the statement that Surg. Gen. Blue has made in reference to this matter. It is as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury, at my request, submitted an estimate for increases in the salaries of my chief clerk and my private secretary. These increases were as follows:

Chief clerk, from \$2,250 to \$2,750.

Private secretary, from \$1,800 to \$2,250.

Both of these employees have worked under my supervision with a devotion and ability which could hardly be exceeded. Throughout the period of the war and the still existing influenza epidemic the bureau has been under heavy pressure, and they have labored without ever sparing themselves and without vacations, doing not only their own work but also the work of others who were sick or taken into the military forces. Service of this character, in my opinion, is invaluable to the Government, and I feel that they are both earning far more than their present salaries. Certainly it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to replace them with equally efficient men at the existing compensation. My private secretary worked so hard and such long hours during the influenza epidemic that I believe he exhausted his vitality, so that when he finally fell a victim to the disease his case was for a time considered almost hopeless.

If these increases can be allowed it will be in no sense extravagance but true economy, for both of these employees by their efficiency save to the Government much more than their salaries.

It was on the basis of those statements that the committee agreed to this increase, and I think it is wise to leave it in the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, without questioning the truth of the showing made by the Surgeon General, I still think that this amendment ought not to be adopted. I have no doubt that many of the heads of departments could make the same sort of showing with reference to employees under them. They may not have done so because of their knowledge of what they thought would be the policy of the committee, and probably of Congress itself, in not picking out one man here and another man there and raising his salary. There is not a question that many of the clerks and secretaries during the war have been put under a much greater strain than they were ever before. It is solely for the injustice, as I conceive, that we are doing to so many more that I am opposed to raising the salary in this case.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this is the only increase that is given to the office of the Surgeon General, I believe. I will say to the Senator that the House, after listening to the testimony, gave the office of the Surgeon General 15 additional clerks. He had asked for more than that; in fact, his office asked for \$31,840 additional for the purpose of paying clerks and bookkeepers. I think, however, in view of the statement made and the earnest request of Gen. Blue, that we were very conservative in this matter, although I think the Senator from Washington is right as to the general proposition. I have not any doubt that there are other items in this bill that it is just as necessary to increase as this particular one, and perhaps more so; but I think the Senator did oppose it in the committee, and it was voted in. As far as I am concerned, I do not care whether it remains at \$1,800 or \$2,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read to line 7 on page 58, the last paragraph read being as follows:

For rent of a storage building and the annex to the Winder Building, \$9,500.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, referring to the item of \$9,500 for rent of storage building and annex to the Winder Building, did we not decide to cut that out?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No. What we did decide to cut out was the rent of the Cox Building, and in addition to doing that we cut out the stables, which I do not think was intended. I have here a letter from Secretary Glass, about which I spoke to the Senator the other day, in reference to the Cox Building, in which he says that to move those files would probably cost more than to pay this rent.

Mr. SMOOT. The only thing about that is we shall have to move them sometime anyhow. The statement that he makes

now is absolutely correct. I think the item that the Senator spoke to me about—for the stables for the Secretary of the Treasury—we ought to put in, as he has decided that he would very much prefer horses rather than an automobile; and as I think one is just as cheap as the other, perhaps the Senator had better put it in at this place.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like also to move to put back the item for the Cox Building. The committee did not authorize it, but the Secretary is so insistent on retaining the Cox Building that I think it is wise to put it in, at least until this new commission on buildings can pass on the matter.

Mr. SMOOT. Perhaps it would be wise to do it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move, then, on page 58, after line 7, to insert the following:

For rent of the Cox Building, \$2,150; for rent of stables, \$1,200.

Mr. SMOOT. What is the rent of the stables?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Twelve hundred dollars.

Mr. SMOOT. One hundred dollars a month is rather a steep rent, is it not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think so myself; but, still, we have not a chance to attend to it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 58, after line 7, it is proposed to insert:

For rent of the Cox Building, \$2,150; for rent of stables, \$1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, the employees for the Cox Building were cut out, also. If we restore the item for the building we will have to restore the employees; so I ask unanimous consent—because we have already passed it—that on page 39, line 1, after the figures "\$660," we insert the following:

Cox Building, two watchmen; laborer.

It merely restores the clerical force that was at the building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 39, line 1, after the numerals "\$660," it is proposed to insert:

Cox Building, two watchmen; laborer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator about the provision on page 58, line 6, for rent of a storage building. What is the nature of that storage? What do they want to store?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We have the exact information in the hearings; I can find it in a moment; but I understand that a number of documents are stored there at this time that are not in present use. I am inclined to think at this time that there are a good many of those old buildings and storage places that ought to be eliminated, but as we have provided a commission to readjust this proposition, I think it is wiser to let the item stay in. We are drifting into an unknown field if we cut it out without a personal examination, and I will say to the Senator that the committee did not have the opportunity to go into that examination.

I think the Senator will find that the House hearings, on page 165, throw light on the question. In response to a letter, the Treasury Department wrote to the Merchants' Transfer & Storage Co. as follows:

JULY 17, 1918.

MERCHANTS' TRANSFER & STORAGE CO.,
920 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: You are informed that the department accepts your proposal, dated July 3, 1918, for the rental of the third and fourth floors and the two rear sections known as "A" and "B" on the fifth floor of the buildings Nos. 920-922 E Street NW., used for the storage of documents and records belonging to the Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, at the rate of \$8,000 per annum, payable from the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Treasury Department, rent, 1919."

It is hereby understood and agreed that the rental of the floors and sections of floor above mentioned is to include electric light, elevator service (passenger and freight), watchman (day and night), and telephone service, the said rental to be paid in equal monthly installments.

The department reserves the right to terminate this agreement either in whole or in part at any time during the fiscal year on 60 days' notice; also to renew the agreement on the same terms dependent upon Congress making the necessary appropriations for the rental of the premises.

You are requested to acknowledge the receipt of this letter.

By direction of the Secretary.

Respectfully,

L. S. ROWE,
Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, does the Senator know whether or not that is a fireproof building?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No, sir; I can not answer that question.

Mr. SMOOT. Why should there be \$9,500 appropriated when the amount specified in the agreement is \$8,000, and that is to include elevator service, watchmen, and so forth?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The appropriation is for two buildings—for the rent of the storage building, and also the annex to the Winder Building—and the appropriation covers the two buildings. The letter that I read covers only one of them. I understand that it is largely filled up with a large mass of files in reference to soldiers' claims.

Mr. WARREN. They are claims and other papers under the Auditor for the War Department which ought to be preserved, but which are too cumbersome and perhaps not of sufficient value to put into fireproof safes.

Mr. SMOOT. I think we ought to notify the heads of departments now that with the number of acres of buildings that we have constructed in the District of Columbia, from now on we are not going to rent any storage rooms for any department of this Government. Let them understand it now, and by the end of next year let them prepare to remove whatever papers they want to have stored to some of the unoccupied buildings that we now have in the District of Columbia.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator from Utah that, as he knows—and he was a party to it—we have put in this bill a provision to take care of that situation. I hope very much that he will be a member of the commission and will give the notice himself, because I am sure he will do good work on the commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Independent Treasury," on page 63, after line 22, to strike out:

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to discontinue the offices of the assistant treasurers at Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and San Francisco from and after July 1, 1919; and section 3595 of the Revised Statutes and all laws or parts of laws so far as they authorize the establishment and maintenance of offices of assistant treasurers in the cities enumerated are repealed from and after the said date.

For such expenses as the Secretary of the Treasury may authorize in connection with the discontinuance of the offices of assistant treasurers, including clerks and counters in the office of the Treasurer in the District of Columbia at rates of compensation not exceeding \$1,800 per annum, salaries of custodians and other employees (at rates of compensation not exceeding \$2,500 per annum) at such of the Sub-treasury offices as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary for the safe-keeping of currency, coin, bullion, bonds, and other securities of the United States, \$75,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall require the custodians or other responsible employees to give bond in such amount and with such surety as he shall deem adequate for the protection of the United States: *Provided further*, That no person employed under a statutory position on June 30, 1919, shall be paid a salary hereunder greater than the amount of such statutory compensation on the said date.

And to insert:

Baltimore, office of assistant treasurer: Assistant treasurer, \$4,500; cashier, \$2,500; paying teller, \$2,000; receiving teller, \$1,900; exchange teller, \$1,800; vault clerk, \$1,800; clerks—2 at \$1,600 each, 3 at \$1,400 each, 3 at \$1,200 each, 3 at \$1,000 each; messenger, \$840; 3 watchmen, at \$720 each; in all, \$31,500.

Boston, office of assistant treasurer: Assistant treasurer, \$5,000; cashier, \$2,500; paying teller, \$2,500; vault clerk, \$2,000; receiving teller, \$2,000; redemption teller, \$1,800; clerks—1 \$2,200, 5 at \$1,600 each, 1 \$1,500, 1 \$1,400, 2 at \$1,200 each, 3 at \$1,100 each, 4 at \$1,000 each; chief guard, \$1,100; 3 watchmen, at \$850 each; laborer and guard, \$720; 4 money counters and handlers for money laundry machines, at \$900 each; in all, \$46,570.

Chicago, office of assistant treasurer: Assistant treasurer, \$5,000; cashier, \$3,000; assistant cashier, \$2,000; vault clerk, \$2,250; paying teller, \$2,500; assorting teller, \$2,000; redemption teller, \$2,000; change teller, \$2,000; receiving teller, \$2,000; 2 bookkeepers, at \$1,500 each; clerks—1 \$1,750, 1 \$1,600, 9 at \$1,500 each, 13 at \$1,200 each; attendant for money laundry machines, \$1,200; hall man, \$1,100; messenger, \$840; 3 watchmen, at \$720 each; janitor, \$720; 8 money counters and handlers for money laundry machines, at \$900 each; in all, \$71,420.

Cincinnati, office of assistant treasurer: Assistant treasurer, \$4,500; cashier, \$2,250; paying teller, \$2,000; receiving teller, \$1,800; vault clerk, \$1,600; clerks—2 at \$1,300 each, 4 at \$1,200 each, 2 at \$1,000 each; clerk and stenographer, \$1,000; chief watchman, \$840; 2 watchmen, at \$720 each; in all, \$24,830.

New Orleans, office of assistant treasurer: Assistant treasurer, \$4,500; cashier, \$2,250; paying teller, \$2,000; receiving teller, \$2,000; vault clerk, \$1,800; assorting teller, \$1,200; clerks—1 \$1,500, 5 at \$1,200 each, 1 \$1,000; typewriter and stenographer, \$1,000; day watchman, \$720; night watchman, \$720; messenger, \$600; 4 guards, at \$720 each; in all, \$28,170.

New York, office of assistant treasurer: Assistant treasurer, \$8,000; cashier, \$4,200; assistant cashier, \$3,600; chief clerk, \$3,000; check pay division—chief \$3,000, assistant chief \$2,000; bond clerk and assistant vault clerk, \$2,800; paying teller, \$3,000; assistant paying teller, \$2,250; receiving teller, \$2,800; redemption division—chief, \$2,700; assistant chief, \$2,250; vault and authorities clerk, \$2,500; coin division—chief, \$2,700; assistant chief, \$2,000; paying teller, \$2,100; bookkeepers—chief, \$2,400; 2 at \$2,000 each; clerks—1 \$2,300, 2 at \$2,000 each, 1 \$1,900, 1 \$1,800, 1 \$1,700, 4 at \$1,600 each; 7 at \$1,500 each; 9 at \$1,400 each; 5 at \$1,300 each, 8 at \$1,200 each, 1 \$1,000; messengers—2 at \$1,200 each, 5 at \$900 each, 2 at \$800 each; guards—chief \$1,500, 1 \$1,200, 4 at \$1,000 each; superintendent of building, \$1,800; engineers—chief \$1,200, 2 at \$1,050 each; 8

watchmen, at \$720 each; 12 money counters and handlers for money laundry machines, at \$900 each; in all, \$150,460.

Philadelphia, office of assistant treasurer: Assistant treasurer, \$5,000; cashier, \$2,500; paying teller, \$2,250; coin teller, \$2,000; vault clerk, \$1,900; bookkeeper, \$1,800; assorting teller, \$1,800; receiving teller, \$1,700; redemption teller, \$1,600; clerks—1 \$1,600, 2 at \$1,500 each, 2 at \$1,400 each, 1 \$1,300, 5 at \$1,200 each, 1 \$1,000; chief guard, \$1,100; 5 counters, at \$900 each; 6 watchmen, at \$720 each; four money counters and handlers for money laundry machines, at \$900 each; in all, \$49,770.

St. Louis, office of assistant treasurer: Assistant treasurer, \$4,500; cashier, \$2,500; paying teller, \$2,000; receiving teller, \$1,800; change teller, \$1,600; coin teller, \$1,200; clerks—2 at \$1,500 each, 5 at \$1,200 each, 2 at \$1,100 each, 3 at \$1,000 each, 3 at \$900 each; 2 watchmen, at \$720 each; 2 janitors, at \$600 each; guard, \$720; in all, \$33,860.

San Francisco, office of assistant treasurer: Assistant treasurer, \$4,500; cashier, who also acts as vault clerk, \$2,800; bookkeeper, \$2,000; paying teller, \$2,400; receiving teller, \$2,000; clerks—1 \$2,000, 2 at \$1,800 each, 1 \$1,500; stenographer and typewriter, \$1,200; messenger, \$840; 4 watchmen, at \$720 each; 2 guards, at \$720 each; in all, \$27,160.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama to state briefly the reasons for cutting out the provision abolishing the Subtreasuries?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The House cut them out. The Senate restored them.

Mr. JONES of Washington. What I mean is, what are the reasons for cutting out the provision that the House put in doing away with the Subtreasuries?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think I can answer that question best by sending to the desk and having read a letter that was sent to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] by Secretary Glass, of the Treasury Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read the letter.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, January 23, 1919.

Hon. THOMAS S. MARTIN,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: My attention is called to the fact that the appropriation bill makes no provision for the continuance of the Subtreasuries nor, indeed, any provision for their discontinuance nor for the transfer of their functions or property. As you know, I am on record as favoring the discontinuance of the Subtreasuries and the transfer of many of their functions to the Federal reserve banks. There has been no change in my view in this respect. At the moment, however, it would be nothing short of a calamity to cast upon the overburdened organization of the Treasury Department, of the Federal reserve banks, and of the Subtreasuries themselves the burden of the very important reorganization which would be necessary, nor can such a reorganization be effected by simply failing to make an appropriation for the continuance of the work of the Subtreasuries. Not all of that work can properly be done by the Federal reserve banks and the Treasury at Washington. The gold and silver reserves of the United States, which the United States holds in trust for its own notes, could not properly be left in the custody of the Federal reserve banks, nor could the gold settlement fund of the Federal reserve banks be properly left in their custody. It is important that the gold and silver reserves of the United States should not be concentrated at one point, but should be distributed at convenient points throughout the country. This is necessary not only from the point of view of economy, but also from the point of view of safety. It will be necessary, therefore, to retain the properties now occupied by some of the Subtreasuries and their vaults and develop a system for the custody of the funds. During the period of the war, with the great financial operations cast upon them by the Government, the Federal reserve banks have been expanding their organizations very rapidly. The Subtreasuries have all been working hard in aid of the Government's financial plans, and I believe there has never been a time when the Subtreasuries have been busier than they have during the war period. This is a temporary condition which will soon come to an end.

Briefly, my request is that the Senate committee restore the appropriation for the Subtreasuries, in which event I shall endeavor, before another general appropriation bill is presented to the Congress, to formulate a plan for submission to the Congress for dealing with the whole problem in an orderly as well as economical way.

Cordially, yours,

CARTER GLASS.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this appropriation of over half a million dollars is another of the "war babies." These Subtreasuries have been continued ever since the establishment of the Federal reserve banks and the regional banks of the Federal Reserve System without a shadow of excuse. The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Glass, has himself opposed continuing the Subtreasuries. I think it was five years ago that we first made a real fight against them in the Senate. At that time I believe we were beaten by one vote. Ever since the war began, the excuse has been given by the Secretary of the Treasury that we should not touch the Subtreasuries until the war was over. Now, Mr. President, the war is over; and the Secretary of the Treasury has promised that before another legislative appropriation bill is up for consideration, he will submit to the Congress certain legislation that will be necessary, as he says, to take care of the funds that are now held at these Subtreasuries.

I wish to give notice now that I shall never allow an appropriation for Subtreasuries to pass the Senate hereafter without

a direct vote upon such a proposition. I can demonstrate beyond a question of a doubt that they are unnecessary. We might just as well appropriate the money to employ people as to keep appropriating money for the maintenance of these Subtreasuries.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, the committee restored the existing law. The language that is now restored in the bill by the Senate committee is exactly in accordance with the existing law. What the Senator from Utah says is true. There was a very considerable division in the committee on this subject; but in view of the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury as to the urgent need of not disturbing that situation at this particular time, and with what he further said in the letter, the committee unanimously agreed to allow this provision to stay in the bill for this year without committing the members of the committee to it in the future. That is the situation.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, at this point I ask to be permitted to state that I have received by telegram and by letter a large number of petitions from the city of Chicago asking that I present to the body the necessity of retaining the office of subtreasurer, the great use the office affords to the business community, and also to present that it has been of great service in view of the late emergencies and exigencies which we all understand have borne heavily upon business generally.

I am like the majority of men in this Chamber, I can not profess the intimate knowledge of business and banking to justify me to say that I could point out wherein these offices were absolutely necessary. The senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is fortunately blessed with a business capacity acknowledged by every one in this Chamber that enables him to speak more authoritatively on a subject like this than we who simply as lawyers have been busy as lawyers and as public men apart from matters of finance. But I beg to submit to the body and the committee that the bankers who sent the petition are all of a very high order of patriotic intelligence, and their policy of interest in government and their desire for economy is no less than our own. They have asked me also to say that the present occupant of the place is a man of independent possession, not depending upon the salary, having no need of the compensation, and is giving such worthy service through that department that to abolish the office would be a great loss to them.

Having made this clear, I think I have discharged my duty. I ask that the Subtreasury be retained at Chicago, and I shall appreciate the courtesy of the committee if it shall be done.

Mr. SMOOT. I will state to the Senator that the Finance Committee of the Senate have agreed that all these Subtreasuries shall remain in the bill for the fiscal year. I do not want to take the time of the Senate now to state why I think they all ought to go out, but I could show in detail the reasons why I think to maintain the Subtreasuries is almost a wicked waste of public money. I know that if that could be shown to the Senator he would be for the abolishment of the offices as quickly as I would.

Mr. LEWIS. May I not make an inquiry? This bill only extends until next year. There will be a new bill next year which may remedy the wrong which may arise.

Mr. SMOOT. The appropriation will have to be made next year and the whole question will arise at that time.

Mr. LEWIS. Then I will not burden the Senate further.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to line 5 on page 74, the last paragraph read being as follows:

Temporary employees: For the temporary employment of such additional force of clerks and other employees as in the judgment of the Secretary of War may be proper and necessary to the prompt, efficient, and accurate dispatch of official business in the War Department and its bureaus, to be allotted by the Secretary of War to such bureaus and offices as the exigencies of the existing situation may demand, \$4,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War shall submit to Congress on the first day of its next regular session a statement showing by bureaus or offices the number and designation of the persons employed hereunder and the annual rate of compensation paid to each: *Provided further*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation in excess of \$5,000 per annum, not more than five persons shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation in excess of \$2,400 per annum each, and not more than 25 persons shall be employed at a rate of compensation in excess of \$1,800 per annum each: *Provided further*, That detailed estimates shall be submitted by the War Department in the annual Book of Estimates for the fiscal year 1921 for necessary services of the character provided for in this paragraph.

Mr. WEEKS. I should like to ask one or two questions relating to the paragraph just read. I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill what clerks the appropriation of \$4,000,000 on page 73, line 15, covers.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My understanding is that those are temporary clerks who came in here due to war conditions.

Mr. WEEKS. And not a permanent force at all?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not a permanent force. The War Department asked for an increase of \$2,000,000 and the committee refused to allow it.

Mr. WEEKS. Has an itemized statement been made to the committee relative to the number of clerks employed under this appropriation?

Mr. WARREN. A short time ago, in answer to a resolution calling for it, we had returns from every department giving the number of clerks employed. I do not happen to have it at hand but the number amounted to some 99,000 here in Washington at the time. If my memory is correct there were some 14,000 in the War Department, but I may be incorrect about it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator that there was a detailed statement put into the hearings on the urgent deficiency bill which was passed several days ago in reference to this item. I have not that hearing with me, but I think the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] has a statement that Gen. Lord left with the committee of the exact number of clerks covered by this item. The statement was made on another bill and therefore I have not the papers with me. I think the Senator from Utah took the blue print of the statement. I do not know whether he has it with him or not.

Mr. SMOOT. I have the figures here taken from the blue print. Gen. Lord appeared before the subcommittee in relation to the \$4,000,000 asked for temporary employees. The original estimate of a year ago was \$11,468,282, of which there was appropriated \$10,277,250.

Mr. WEEKS. That was for the War Department alone?

Mr. SMOOT. That was for temporary employees for the War Department. Then the estimate for the coming fiscal year was for \$5,940,570. The House gave \$4,000,000, and they figured it out about as follows: There were on the 1st of November, 1918, 17,156 additional employees in the War Department to be paid out of this appropriation under the heading of "Temporary employees."

Mr. WEEKS. That was for next year?

Mr. SMOOT. No; that is the number of employees actually in service November 1, 1918. Now, the estimated number of employees for the first quarter of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, was 10,114, and an average for the whole year of about 5,500. In other words, the number that will be discharged from July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, will cause an average of employees in that department of 5,500 under the heading of "Temporary employees."

Mr. WEEKS. Then there is sure to be a deficit, if there is an average number of temporary employees equal to the number stated by the Senator from Utah, because 5,500 employees at \$1,000 a year would require \$5,500,000.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true, but—

Mr. WEEKS. They will not be employed at \$1,000 a year. They will be employed at \$1,200.

Mr. SMOOT. Not on an average, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. WEEKS. Pretty close to it.

Mr. SMOOT. Not temporary employees. They will not average more than about \$1,080, but that will amount to about \$6,000,000. I will say to the Senator that the Secretary asked for \$6,000,000, stating that that will cover what they desire.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not know any temporary employees of any considerable number employed at the low rate of \$1,080.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that was the estimate the Secretary gave. There are a great many of these temporary employees, and it is just ordinary work requiring no particular education or experience. The estimate was for \$6,000,000, but in questioning the general it developed that taking the number of employees they have in each one of the divisions, beginning with The Adjutant General's office and following with the Inspector General's office and the Signal Corps, the Quartermaster Corps, the Chief of Ordnance, the Chief of Engineers, the Bureau of Insular Affairs, and the Coast Artillery, it did develop that it might not be necessary to have an average of 5,500 employees. So the committee of the House on the hearings, and also the committee of the Senate, decided that there would not be required 5,500 additional employees.

I can give the Senator, if he wants it, the number of employees they have in each one of the departments I have mentioned. When added together it shows without any question that they can hardly justify employing that number. Gen. Lord, after we went into the details of the case, did say: "Well, perhaps we can get along with less than the \$5,940,570; and, no doubt, if there is a shortage and more employees required than actually appropriated for there will be a deficiency bill, anyhow, passed before June 30 of next year, and it can be taken care of in that bill."

Mr. WEEKS. I should like the attention of the Senator from Alabama for a moment. It seems to me, if the number of

employees estimated for are actually employed, very much more than \$4,000,000 will be required, and they certainly will be employed, in my judgment, unless there is some positive prohibition against it.

Mr. SMOOT. They certainly will be employed if the appropriation is made, I will say to the Senator, and that is one reason why we thought we would limit the appropriation. I think they will be a little more careful in the employment of men and women if the appropriation were not actually in their hands. I do not believe the department is going to suffer by allowing the amount to remain at \$4,000,000.

Mr. WEEKS. I have no amendment to offer. What I particularly want to call attention to is the proneness of bureau officials to continue employees who happen to be in their service and the indisposition to make any reduction unless there is a positive necessity for it. What I am fearful of is that, as to these employees, whether absolutely needed or not, there can be reasons given for their employment, and there will be a large deficiency applying to this particular item next year.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the Senator from Massachusetts that when Gen. Lord was before the Senate committee he, among other things, said:

As I stated before, these clerks are not needed for the entire fiscal year 1920. That is, it would be absurd to think that we would need them all through the year. We will need more in the first quarter than we will in the second; we will need more in the second quarter than we will in the third. I have made an estimate here, which is purely arbitrary, showing that beginning with the first quarter we will have 10,140, beginning with the second quarter we will have 7,400, beginning with the third quarter we will have 5,000, and beginning with the fourth quarter we will have 3,000, estimating the pay of these clerks on a basis of \$1,100 each, and I think that is a little small.

On that basis he wanted nearly \$6,000,000. The committee refused to raise the House estimate for exactly the same reason the Senator has given, but we did not feel justified in cutting it any more.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that we tried to impress upon the officials of all the departments that Congress was not going to stand the enormous number of employees that have been used in the different departments. Employees have been so crowded that they were stepping on each other's toes. I think myself I could have taken 60 per cent of the employees in all the departments and, under favorable conditions, they would have done more work than the whole 100 per cent have done in the past.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Yes; 50 per cent more work.

Mr. SMOOT. For that reason we told not only Gen. Lord but every one of the department officials that the employment of unnecessary clerks had to cease.

Mr. WEEKS. I happened to make inquiry the other day and I found in one bureau there were about a thousand employees doing work about one-half in amount of that in another bureau where there were about 12,000 employees. There should be a thorough overhauling of the whole system of operations. I do not see how you are to prevent the expenditure of \$6,000,000 for this item, including a deficiency of \$2,000,000, unless it is provided that the number of employees engaged or kept at work shall not be more than sufficient to use the \$4,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not absolutely necessary to use it, but I say to the Senator it will be used, I am quite sure of that, for I never have known an appropriation yet made for the purpose of employing people that every dollar of it was not expended.

Mr. WEEKS. Of course it will be expended.

Mr. SMOOT. I want in this connection to say to the Senator that there has been introduced in the House and in the Senate a number of bills the purpose of which is the same, and that is to furnish the record of all the soldiers from the different States to the adjutant generals of the States. I was requested by the adjutant general of the State of Utah to introduce the bill, and I did so, but I had no idea what it was going to cost the Government of the United States, nor do I believe any Member of the House or any Member of the Senate when he introduced the bill recognized the enormous expense it would be to the Government of the United States. That was mentioned by Gen. Lord as a great burden that would be placed upon the War Department if that legislation passed, and if it did become law Congress ought to make an appropriation to cover the expense it would entail.

It was stated by Gen. Lord that, in order to furnish the information asked for within 12 months, it would require over 1,000 additional employees in the War Department. When that legislation comes before the Senate for consideration, I want Senators to understand what it is going to cost the Government of the United States to execute it. There may be such a demand from the different States and such pressure brought upon Members of the House and of the Senate, that they will vote for the legislation; but, if they do, I want them to know that

undoubtedly there will be over 1,000 employees engaged in the War Department for more than a year for that purpose.

So far as I am concerned, I should prefer to wait a few years until we can again get our breath; until the people of the United States can ascertain upon what basis their business stands; until every father and mother in the country may take stock of what they owe, how far they may be able to meet their obligations, and what obligations they will have to meet in the future. I desire to say, further, that it is not merely the burdens which they have now to carry, but their burdens will be added to for the next few years, and so far as the removal of the burdens is concerned there is not a person now 20 years old who will live long enough to see those burdens entirely removed.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "War Department," on page 75, line 21, after the word "each" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "advisory architect, \$4,000"; in line 23, after the word "each," to strike out "supervising engineer, \$2,750"; and on page 76, line 3, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$410,340," and insert "\$403,590," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Quartermaster General: Chief clerk, \$2,750; principal clerks, 5 at \$2,250 each; 3 at \$2,000 each; clerks, 15 of class 4, 29 of class 3, 50 of class 2, 93 of class 1, 59 at \$1,000 each, 10 at \$900 each; draftsmen, 3 at \$1,800 each, 7 at \$1,600 each, 5 at \$1,400 each; hydraulic and sanitary engineer, \$2,000; civil engineer, \$1,800; electrical engineer, \$2,000; electrical and mechanical engineer, \$2,250; marine engineer, \$3,500; sanitary and heating engineer, \$1,800; 6 messengers; 14 assistant messengers; 12 laborers; laborer, \$600; in all, \$403,590.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Navy Department," on page 85, line 3, after the word "offices," to strike out "on account of the existing emergency," so as to make the clause read:

Temporary employees: For the employment of such additional temporary force of clerks, messengers, laborers, and other assistants as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy may be necessary to the transaction of official business in the Navy Department and its bureaus and offices, as follows.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, after line 5, to insert: Office of the solicitor, \$10,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, after line 6, to insert: Office of the Judge Advocate General, \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, after line 7, to insert: Naval Observatory, \$2,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 19, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$1,046,000" and insert "\$1,064,450"; and, in line 24, after the words "Provided further," to strike out:

That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation in excess of \$5,000 per annum, not more than five persons shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation in excess of \$2,400 per annum each, and not more than 20 persons shall be employed at a rate of compensation in excess of \$2,000 per annum each.

And insert:

That not more than 49 persons shall be employed hereunder at rates of compensation in excess of \$2,000 per annum, of whom not more than 39 shall be employed at a rate of compensation in excess of \$2,400 per annum and not more than 10 at a rate of compensation in excess of \$4,000 per annum.

So as to make the clause read:

In all, \$1,064,450: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to Congress on the first day of its next regular session a statement showing by bureaus or offices the number and designation of the persons employed hereunder and the annual rate of compensation paid to each: *Provided further*, That not more than 49 persons shall be employed hereunder at rates of compensation in excess of \$2,000 per annum, of whom not more than 39 shall be employed at a rate of compensation in excess of \$2,400 per annum and not more than 10 at a rate of compensation in excess of \$4,000 per annum: *Provided further*, That detailed estimates shall be submitted by the Navy Department in the annual Book of Estimates for the fiscal year 1921 for necessary services of the character provided for in this paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, the amendment on page 86, beginning in line 5, was made at the request of the Navy Department, but they now seem to be of the opinion that the language used may cause some difficulty in carrying out what they desire, and they have changed the language, though not the amount of the appropriation, to conform to their wishes. I send to the desk and ask to have read the substitute which they propose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the amendment proposed by the committee inserting the language from line 5 to line 10, on page 86, it is proposed to insert:

That not more than 49 persons shall be employed hereunder at rates of compensation in excess of \$2,000 per annum, of whom not more than 10 shall be employed at a rate of compensation in excess of \$2,400 per annum and not more than \$4,000 per annum.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The only change is one of phraseology, which clarifies the language. I move the adoption of the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 87, line 3, after the word "including," to insert "an expert historian at \$4,000 per annum and two assistants at \$3,000 per annum each, and," and in line 8, after the word "person," to insert "except those specifically provided for in this paragraph," so as to make the clause read:

Toward the collection or copying and classification, with a view to publication, of the naval records of the war with the central powers of Europe, including an expert historian at \$4,000 per annum and two assistants at \$3,000 per annum each, and clerical services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, preparation of maps and illustrations, and other necessary incidental expenses, \$20,000: *Provided*, That no person except those specifically provided for in this paragraph shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 96, after line 23, to strike out:

For rental of additional quarters for the Navy Department, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed; and the Secretary read to line 14, on page 106, the last paragraph read being as follows:

For investigation of rural education, industrial education, physical education, and school hygiene, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and no salary shall be paid hereunder in excess of \$3,500 per annum, \$50,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I will say, in relation to the item just read, that I shall offer an amendment to it when such an amendment will be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed; and the Secretary read to line 16, on page 113, the last two paragraphs read being as follows:

Territory of Hawaii: Governor, \$7,000; secretary, \$4,000; chief justice, \$6,000; two associate justices, at \$5,500 each; in all, \$28,000. For judges of circuit courts, at \$4,000 each, so much as may be necessary, for the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator in charge of the bill why there is no provision in the Hawaiian items just read, for the pay of the Federal judges in Hawaii.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator will find that item under the head of "Judicial," on page 147, of the bill.

Mr. MYERS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed; and the Secretary read in line 20, on page 115, the last paragraph read being as follows:

In making readjustments hereunder, the salary of any clerk in any class may be fixed by the Postmaster General at \$100 below the salary fixed by law for such class and the unused portion of such salary shall be used to increase the salary of any clerk in any class entitled thereto by not less than \$100 above the salary fixed by law for such class. The Postmaster General shall assign to the several bureaus, offices, and divisions of the Post Office Department such number of the employees herein authorized as may be necessary to perform the work required therein; and he shall submit a statement showing such assignment and the number employed at the various salaries in the annual Book of Estimates following the estimates for salaries in the Post Office Department.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if this provision regarding readjustments and reductions of salary and increases of salary by the Postmaster General is new legislation, or whether it is usually carried in the bill? I refer to the item on page 115, beginning in line 8, with reference to readjustments of salaries.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the existing law, and has been carried in the bill for a good many years.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Why do we need to carry it in the bill, if that is the law?

Mr. WARREN. That is the law; but it was originally inserted as a part of an annual appropriation bill, and therefore it has been necessary to repeat the language in each annual appropriation bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Then, instead of providing for it in each bill, why not provide for it here once for all?

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that when it was first put in the proposition was to try it out, and they asked for further time to try it the second year, and since that time the matter has not come up on any question as to whether or not it should be put in as a regular statute, but it has been repeatedly in each appropriation bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Can the Senator tell me how long it has been thus repeated on these appropriation bills, or about how long?

Mr. SMOOT. Since three years ago.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Utah says since three years ago.

Mr. WARREN. I should think it was about three years ago that it was first put in, or more than that.

Mr. JONES of Washington. How has it worked out? Does anybody know?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand it is to give flexibility in the adjustment of salaries between the \$200 grade and the various salaries.

Mr. SMOOT. In other words, the existing law is that the promotions may be \$200 in grade. Many times it is found there are promotions made of those who are not really qualified to fill the position that is required, and this simply gives the Postmaster General a chance to grant a promotion of \$100 instead of \$200 and use that difference of \$100 in granting further promotions to employees who are worthy and have qualified themselves for promotion.

I wish to say to the Senator that as far as any saving of money to the Government is concerned, it has not done it unless it has been through greater efficiency on the part of the employees. If the report is true, as I read it, it has worked a wonderful improvement in the Post Office Department in that respect.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If that is the intention, if it is a good thing, why not make it a part of the permanent law?

Mr. SMOOT. There is some reason for the Senator asking that question. I think perhaps the present law ought to be amended so that this provision will hereafter apply permanently, but I will state to the Senator that the Postmaster General in asking this asked it upon the theory that he believes it would be a great improvement and bring about a greater efficiency in the department. He says that it has done so, and I believe it has. I think those who made the examination of the question will also make a similar statement. I myself think it would be a very good thing to amend the existing law by adding this provision to it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Can the Senator tell me about this? I note here it says the Postmaster General may reduce a clerk "\$100 below the salary fixed by law," while it says he shall use what he saves by doing that by increasing the salaries of clerks "by not less than \$100"; that is, he can increase the salary of any man from \$100 up.

Mr. SMOOT. Within \$100.

Mr. JONES of Washington. "By not less than \$100," is the way it reads.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that under the existing law the promotions go according to the grade of \$200, and the Postmaster General could increase here the salary of one employee \$100 if he saves the \$100 on another employee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If he saves \$500 by reductions, he can add that to one increase.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Then, what does this language mean?

Shall be used to increase the salary of any clerk in any class entitled thereto by not less than \$100.

Why does it not say "by \$100"?

Mr. SMOOT. He can not increase it more than \$100, because he has only saved \$100.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But suppose he has saved \$200 by two reductions and is only going to raise one clerk, can he not use the \$200 for that purpose?

Mr. SMOOT. I will read it to the Senator as a whole, and then I think he will understand it.

In making readjustments hereunder, the salary of any clerk—

That is, one clerk, remember—

in any class may be fixed by the Postmaster General at \$100 below the salary fixed by law for such class and the unused portion of such salary—

That is, the \$100—

shall be used to increase the salary of any clerk in any class entitled thereto by not less than \$100 above the salary fixed by law for such class.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Why do you use the words, "by not less than \$100" there? Why not say, "by \$100"?

Mr. SMOOT. Because of the fact that he may use only \$50 of it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Why, no.

Mr. SMOOT. "Not less than \$100" means that he shall use whatever he has saved on a clerk by increasing the other clerk's salary. In other words, he can not increase the salary of one \$100 unless he saves the \$100 from some other employee's salary.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know that he can not increase salaries unless he saves something to increase with; but what I was getting at is, if he reduces five clerks in class 1 he has saved \$500. Can he use that \$500 to increase any other clerk in any other class more than \$100?

Mr. SMOOT. No; he can use that to increase the salary of five clerks \$100 each, and not more than \$100.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Why does it not say "increase by \$100" instead of "by not less than \$100"? That is what I can not understand. Why not say "shall be used to increase the salary of any clerk in any class entitled thereto by \$100"?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It goes in \$100 skips.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Why not say so? What is the significance of "not less"?

Mr. SMOOT. It only emphasizes the fact that the Postmaster General shall not have the right to take \$100 from one clerk and use it in any other way than to give it to another clerk. That is the object of it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That may be the object of it, but it seems to me that under this language if he saved \$200 on two clerks of any class he could give one clerk of some other class under this wording a \$200 increase.

Mr. SMOOT. I will state to the Senator that that has not been the practice.

Mr. JONES of Washington. What I am trying to ascertain is what the Postmaster General can do under this language and what it is intended to give him authority to do. It seems to me that we ought to strike out the words "not less than" and let him increase by \$100.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The adjustment of salaries is not by steps of \$10 or \$20 but \$100, and if he cuts the salary of one clerk to the extent of \$100 he can add it to another clerk's salary to the extent of \$100, no more and no less.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Why not say so, then?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the construction of it. It has been passed upon by the comptroller and is workable on that basis.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If he has construed this language to mean that, I do not know upon what he bases his construction. He has been trying to legislate, I suppose.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Justice," in the item of appropriation for the office of the Attorney General, Division of Accounts, on page 120, line 10, after the word "Chief," to strike out "\$2,750" and insert "\$3,000," and in line 14, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$473,620" and insert "\$473,870," so as to read:

Division of Accounts: Chief, \$3,000; administrative accountant, \$2,500; chief bookkeeper and record clerk, \$2,200; clerks—3 of class 4, 6 of class 3, 6 of class 2, 5 of class 1, 3 at \$900 each; in all, \$473,870.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and continued to the end of line 16, on page 126, the last clause read being as follows:

Commercial attachés: For commercial attachés, to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, after examination to be held under his direction to determine their competency and to be accredited through the State Department, whose duties shall be to investigate and report upon such conditions in the manufacturing industries and trade of foreign countries as may be of interest to the United States; and for one clerk to each of said commercial attachés to be paid a salary not to exceed \$1,500 each and for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses of officers, rent outside of the District of Columbia, purchase of reports, books of reference and periodicals, travel to and from the United States, exchange on official checks, and all other necessary expenses not included in the foregoing; such commercial attachés shall serve directly under the Secretary of Commerce and shall report directly to him, \$165,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Alabama with reference to these commercial attachés. Can he tell me how many the Secretary of Commerce has been appointing and what salary has been paid them?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can give the Senator the information in just a moment, I think. I will say, however, that the provision is carried in existing law. I think there are 10 or a dozen of these attachés. My recollection is—and I think I can tell the Senator definitely in a moment—that whatever the

salary is, it is fixed by a law passed by Congress, designating the number of men who are to be employed and the amount of their salaries.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I thought in this case it was a lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No. Whilst I am not sure, I think this was a provision which was put into the law creating the Department of Commerce, though it may have been a subsequent law; anyway, it is a law.

The reading of the bill was resumed on page 126, line 17, the last clause read being as follows:

In all, for inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, \$697,950.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Alabama whether the committee considered the proposal with reference to the increase of the salaries of these employees? I have received a great many letters and some telegrams regarding the steamboat inspectors.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Washington will remember that at the last session of Congress there was a special bill passed increasing the salaries of these various inspectors. I do not know whether or not the Senator has received any requests of late for the increase of their salaries, but they had a large increase of salary, I will say to the Senator, a year ago.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have been getting letters recently, especially with reference to the assistant inspectors.

Mr. SMOOT. The assistant inspectors were taken care of in the special bill to which I refer, I will say to the Senator.

The reading of the bill was resumed on line 20, page 127; and the Secretary read to line 11, on page 135, the last paragraph read being as follows:

To determine experimentally important physical constants of materials essential to the industries or in laboratory investigations, as authorized by law, such as the determination of the value of gravity, thermal conductivities of materials, mechanical equivalent of heat, metallurgical constants such as specific and latent heats of metals and alloys, the electrochemical equivalent of metals, the velocity of light, including data important in the efficient planning of industrial processes, and in the effective utilization of the properties of materials, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$5,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if the subcommittee gave any consideration to the estimate of the department for industrial safety standards, reading:

To investigate conditions of personal hazard in industrial and mercantile establishments—

And so forth.

They sent in an estimate of \$25,000 covering that, and it impressed me as a very desirable appropriation. I see that there is nothing in the bill about it, and I wondered whether the subcommittee investigated that estimate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that so far as the Senate subcommittee is concerned, we did not go into that estimate. It was before the House. The matter was estimated for. The House turned it down, and in the testimony before the Senate subcommittee it was not insisted on by anyone from the Bureau of Standards. I do not mean to say that they objected to it, but they did not push it, and the Senate committee did not include it in the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Will the Senator tell me who appeared before the committee from the bureau?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Dr. Stratton appeared on other items.

Mr. JONES of Washington. He represented the bureau?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Did the committee consider the estimate sent down for standardization and testing of mechanical appliances, the estimate reading:

To develop methods of testing and standardizing machines, motors, tools, measuring instruments—

And so forth, for the purpose of adopting and making public an industrial safety code?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Dr. Stratton appeared before the committee; and if the Senator will refer to his testimony before the Senate committee, on page 132, he will find that those items were not stressed. As there were many large appropriations in this bill for the Bureau of Standards anyhow, the Senate committee did not include those items that were not particularly urged on their attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRENALD in the chair). The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Judicial," on page 146, line 23, after "\$4,500," to insert "nine law clerks, one for the Chief Justice and one for each Associate Justice, at not exceeding \$3,600 each"; and, on page 147, line 2, after the words "in all," to strike out

"\$153,500" and insert "\$185,900," so as to make the clause read:

Supreme Court: Chief Justice, \$15,000; eight Associate Justices, at \$14,500 each; marshal, \$4,500; nine law clerks, one for the Chief Justice and one for each Associate Justice, at not exceeding \$3,600 each; nine stenographic clerks, one for the Chief Justice and one for each Associate Justice, at not exceeding \$2,000 each; in all, \$185,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 147, line 5, after the word "at," to strike out "\$7,000 each" and insert "\$8,500 each from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive," and, in line 9, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$265,500" and insert "\$331,500," so as to make the clause read:

Circuit Courts of Appeals: Thirty-three circuit judges, at \$8,500 each from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive; nine clerks of circuit courts of appeals, at \$3,500 each; messenger, to act as librarian and crier, circuit court of appeals, eighth circuit, \$3,000; in all, \$331,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. By inadvertence the words "per annum" were left out in the arrangement of the judicial salaries in several places. I have a memorandum where they should be inserted and I ask that the clerks at the desk, if there is no objection, insert them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERNALD in the chair). Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The next amendment was, on page 147, line 11, after the word "at," to strike out "\$6,000 each, \$582,000" and insert "\$7,500 each from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive, \$776,000," so as to make the clause read:

District courts: Ninety-seven district judges, at \$7,500 each from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive, \$776,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 147, line 14, after the word "at," to strike out "\$6,000 each" and insert "\$7,500 each from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive," and in line 16, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$16,200" and insert "\$20,200," so as to make the clause read:

District court, Territory of Hawaii: Two judges, at \$7,500 each from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive; clerk, \$3,000; reporter, \$1,200; in all, \$20,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 147, line 18, after the word "judge," to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$7,500 per annum from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive," and in line 19, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$8,000" and insert "\$11,333.34," so as to make the clause read:

District Court for Porto Rico: District judge, \$7,500 per annum from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive; clerk, \$3,000; in all, \$11,333.34.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 148, line 2, after the words "Chief justice," to strike out "\$7,500" and insert "at \$8,500 per annum from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive"; in line 4, after the word "at," to strike out "\$7,000 each" and insert "\$8,500 each from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive"; and in line 15, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$36,710" and insert "\$42,043.34," so as to make the clause read:

Court of Appeals, District of Columbia: Chief justice, at \$8,500 per annum from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive; two associate justices, at \$8,500 each from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive; clerk, \$3,250, and \$250 additional as custodian of the Court of Appeals Building; assistant or deputy clerk, \$2,250; reporter, \$1,500: *Provided*, That the reports issued by him shall not be sold for more than \$5 per volume; crier, who shall also act as stenographer and typewriter in the clerk's office when not engaged in court room, \$1,200; three messengers, at \$720 each; three stenographers, one for the chief justice and one for each associate justice, at \$1,200 each; necessary expenditures in the conduct of the clerk's office, \$1,000; in all, \$42,043.34, one-half of which shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 148, line 18, after the word "justice," to strike out "\$6,500" and insert "\$7,500 from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive"; in line 19, after the word "at," to strike out "\$6,000" and insert "\$7,500 each from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive"; and in line 23, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$43,100" and insert "\$54,433.34," so as to make the clause read:

Supreme Court, District of Columbia: Chief justice, \$7,500 from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive; five associate justices, at \$7,500 each from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive; six stenographers, one for the chief justice and one for each associate justice, at \$1,100 each; in all, \$54,433.34, one-half of which shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 149, line 18, after the word "at," to strike out "\$7,000 each" and insert "\$8,500 each from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive"; and in line 22, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$54,840" and insert "\$64,840," so as to make the clause read:

Court of Customs Appeals: Presiding judge and four associate judges, at \$8,500 each from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive; marshal, \$3,000; clerk, \$3,500; assistant clerk, \$2,000; five stenographic clerks, at \$1,600 each; stenographic reporter, \$2,500; messenger, \$840; in all, \$64,840.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 150, line 8, after the word "Justice," to strike out "\$6,500" and insert "at \$8,000 per annum from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive"; in line 10, after the word "at," to strike out "\$6,000" and insert "\$7,500 each from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive"; and in line 18, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$59,080" and insert "\$69,080," so as to make the clause read:

Court of Claims: Chief Justice, at \$8,000 per annum from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive; four judges, at \$7,500 each from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive; chief clerk, \$3,500; assistant clerk, \$2,500; bailiff, \$1,500; clerks—two at \$1,600 each (one of whom shall be a stenographer), one \$1,400, two at \$1,200 each; four stenographers, at \$1,200 each; chief messenger, \$1,000; two assistant messengers; three firemen; three watchmen; elevator conductor, \$720; two laborers; two charwomen; in all, \$69,080.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 8 on page 153, the last clause read being as follows:

Sec. 6. That all civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and the District of Columbia who receive a total of compensation at the rate of \$2,500 per annum or less, except as otherwise provided in this section, shall receive, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, additional compensation at the rate of \$240 per annum.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Alabama allow this section to go over, as there will be a contest over it, and after we get through with the bill we can then call for a quorum.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is not subject to amendment at this time, because there is no Senate committee amendment. It will have to go over until we finish the bill, as far as that item is concerned, because an agreement has been made that the Senate committee amendments shall be considered first.

Mr. SMOOT. This section contains the amendment of the committee in relation to the War Risk Insurance Bureau. I think the whole section had better go over, and then we will take it up when we get a quorum here.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection to the section going over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the section, including the amendment of the committee on page 153, will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, on page 158, after line 14, to insert:

Sec. 8. That a joint commission is created to be known as the "Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries," which shall consist of three Senators, who will be Members of the Sixty-sixth Congress, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Representatives, who will be Members of the Sixty-sixth Congress, to be appointed by the Speaker. Vacancies occurring in the membership of the commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

It shall be the duty of the commission to investigate the rates of compensation paid to civilian employees by the municipal government and the various executive departments and other governmental establishments in the District of Columbia, except the navy yard and the Postal Service, and report by bill or otherwise, as soon as practicable, what reclassification and readjustment of compensation should be made so as to provide uniform and equitable pay for the same character of employment throughout the District of Columbia in the services enumerated.

The commission is authorized to sit during the sessions or recess of Congress, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses, and to employ such personal services and incur such expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

The heads of the various governmental services and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall furnish office space and equipment, detail officers and employees, furnish data and information, and make investigations whenever requested by the commission in connection with the purposes of this section.

For payment of the expenses authorized to be incurred, there is appropriated \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be available immediately and to be disbursed upon vouchers approved by the commission, which approval shall be conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Treasury Department.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to make a suggestion, or, rather, to ask the opinion of the Senator from Alabama upon a suggestion with reference to this commission. I am heartily in favor of the object and purposes of the commission. I think it is very important, and we ought to have had it quite a good while ago. I intended to make this suggestion before the committee when the bill was up for consideration, but the Senator knows how we were pressed for time and how we had to have a meeting in the afternoon and a great many Senators had to be in the

Senate. I could not be there, and I did not have an opportunity to suggest it.

I suggest that this commission ought to be composed of Senators and Representatives of the present Congress who are going out of Congress, and I wish to state to the Senator why I think so. The Senator knows as well as I do that Senators and Representatives are just as busy as they can be with the ordinary duties of Senators and Representatives with the business that is brought before them. We really do not have the opportunity to attend committee meetings now as we ought to do it. The result of taking Senators and Representatives who are Members of Congress will be that they will, of course, give as much time as they can to the work, but probably there will be two or three or three or four in attendance at a meeting at a time, and they will have to perform the duties when probably they would like to be at home taking a rest or something of that sort, or they will have to neglect the active duties of their position.

There are Senators and Representatives who are going out of Congress who are some of the ablest Members of the Senate and the House, men who are thoroughly familiar with the conditions we seek to remedy by this amendment. I think men who are familiar with those conditions ought to be on this commission. From these gentlemen I have no doubt we can get a sufficient number to serve upon the commission. We shall probably have to provide compensation for them, but I think that is entirely proper. If we could get three Members of the Senate who are going out and three Members of the House who are going out they could devote all their time to this work, and could probably have their report ready for us by the meeting of our next regular session. These Senators and Representatives are just as competent men as we have in either body, and they would render just as valuable service in connection with this work. I believe we will get a great deal better result and more rapid work by having a commission of that kind than to have the commission as proposed here. I ask the Senator whether any consideration was given to that matter?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; the suggestion was not made at all and has not been considered, but I do think the suggestion of the Senator is worthy of consideration. If the Senator desires to offer an amendment we can consider it now, or, if the Senator will allow it to stay as it is when it goes to conference, the whole matter will be in conference and I will make the suggestion to the House conferees.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does the Senator think what I have suggested would be in conference and that the conferees would have a right to report something of this sort?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Undoubtedly it would all be in conference, because the House could vote such changes in reference to the personnel of the commission as they saw fit. I do not wish to commit myself on the question now, but I think the question is worthy of very serious consideration. If the Senator desires not to offer an amendment to the bill I will be glad to call it to the attention of the House conferees and discuss it very thoroughly.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I believe with that statement from the Senator in charge of the bill I will not take the time of the Senate to offer the amendment, if the matter is to be in conference. I hope the Senator will give the suggestion his thought and consideration in the meantime, and that the adoption of this section by the Senate without any controversy will not make him feel that he is absolutely bound to adhere to its terms.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think after our conversation here on the floor, without objection from anyone, I would be justified in agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. With that understanding I shall not offer the amendment, but I do hope the conference committee will consider the suggestion.

Mr. WARREN. I think it is entirely worthy of consideration. We might have to examine the situation to see whether we would be able to find those who would accept the position. That is the only doubt I have in my mind.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not believe there would be any trouble, because we have to provide compensation for them. We could not expect those men to work for nothing, but I believe it would be money saved to pay men of that kind probably \$1,000 a month until they submit their report, and we could require them, probably, to submit a report in six months or something like that.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 160, to insert:

Sec. 9. Public Buildings Commission: With a view to the control and allotment of space in owned or leased Government buildings in the District of Columbia, a public buildings commission is hereby created to be composed of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of

the Senate and two other members of said committee, to be appointed by said chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate and two other members of said committee, to be appointed by said chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and two other members of said committee, to be appointed by said chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives, and two other members of said committee, to be appointed by said chairman, all of whom shall serve thereon only so long as they are Members of Congress, and the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds, the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds, and the Supervising Architect or the Acting Supervising Architect of the Treasury during any vacancy in said office. Said commission shall elect one of its members as chairman of the commission and is authorized to employ such expert clerical or other services as it may deem necessary.

Any vacancies in said commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments were made.

Said commission shall have the absolute control of and the allotment of all space in the several public buildings owned or buildings leased by the United States in the District of Columbia, with the exception of the Executive Mansion and office of the President, Capitol Building, the Senate and House Office Buildings, the Capitol power plant, and the Congressional Library Building, and shall from time to time assign and allot, for the use of the several activities of the Government, all such space.

For expenses of said commission, \$10,000, to be immediately available and remain available until expended and to be paid out on vouchers signed by the chairman of said commission.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment by inserting on line 6, page 161, after the words "power plant" and the comma, the words "the buildings under the jurisdiction of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think that amendment to the amendment should be agreed to. It merely brings the buildings of the Smithsonian Institution within the general plan. I think it is a proper amendment to the committee amendment, and I accept it.

Mr. LODGE. Those buildings are all provided for now by statute and placed under the control of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, since the pending bill was reported to the Senate a revenue bill has been passed providing a change of compensation for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and providing for deputy commissioners of internal revenue. I have talked with members of the committee about the changes of the law. In the revenue bill there is a provision made which authorizes the appointment and payment of the salaries of these officers up to the 1st day of July next, but there is no provision of law to carry their salaries after that date. I therefore desire to offer an amendment to conform to existing law and to provide those salaries after the 1st day of July. I send the amendment which I propose to the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 53, line 5, after the numerals "\$10,000" and the semicolon, it is proposed to insert:

Assistant commissioner, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 53, line 5, after the words "deputy commissioners," it is proposed to strike out the words "two at \$4,000 each, one \$3,600," and to insert in lieu thereof "five, at \$5,000 each."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That completes the committee amendments. I will ask the Secretary to now state the committee amendment which was passed over.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment on page 154, line 21, by striking out the words "except that" and inserting the article "The," and on line 23 to strike out the words "at one-half the rate." That would make the amendment read:

The employees of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance shall receive increased compensation allowed by this section for other employees.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask the Senator if he will not withhold that suggestion until the amendment proposed by the committee may be read. That has not yet been done.

Mr. CURTIS. I thought that had been done.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No.

Mr. LODGE. It has not been read.

Mr. CURTIS. Very well.

The SECRETARY. The committee amendment passed over was, in section 6, page 154, line 21, after the date "January 1, 1916," to insert "except that employees of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance shall receive increased compensation at one-half the rate allowed by this section for other employees: *Provided*, That employees of said bureau who are compensated at rates below

\$400 per annum shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 60 per cent of the annual rates of compensation received by such employees," so as to read:

The provisions of this section shall not apply to the following: Employees paid from the postal revenues and sums which may be advanced from the Treasury to meet deficiencies in the postal revenues; employees of the Panama Canal on the Canal Zone; employees of the Alaskan Engineering Commission in Alaska; employees paid from lump-sum appropriations in bureaus, divisions, commissions, or any other governmental agencies or employments created by law since January 1, 1916, except that employees of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance shall receive increased compensation at one-half the rate allowed by this section for other employees: *Provided*, That employees of said bureau who are compensated at rates below \$400 per annum shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 60 per cent of the annual rates of compensation received by such employees.

This amendment Mr. CURTIS proposes to amend on page 154, line 21, by striking out, before the word "employees," the words "except that" and inserting the article "the"; and, on line 23, after the word "compensation," by striking out the words "at one-half the rate."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offered this amendment in the committee, but it was voted down.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---------------|----------------|------------|--------------|
| Ashurst | Hardwick | Moses | Smith, S. C. |
| Bankhead | Henderson | New | Smoot |
| Beckham | Johnson, Cal. | Norris | Sterling |
| Calder | Jones, N. Mex. | Nugent | Swanson |
| Chamberlain | Jones, Wash. | Pittman | Thomas |
| Cummins | Kendrick | Pollock | Thompson |
| Curtis | Kenyon | Pomerene | Townsend |
| Dillingham | Kirby | Ransdell | Trammell |
| Fernald | La Follette | Reed | Underwood |
| Fletcher | Lenroot | Robinson | Vardaman |
| France | Lewis | Shafroth | Warren |
| Frelinghuysen | Lodge | Sheppard | Weeks |
| Gay | McKellar | Sherman | Williams |
| Gronna | McLean | Shields | Wolcott |
| Hale | McNary | Simmons | |
| Harding | Martin, Ky. | Smith, Ga. | |

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to take up unnecessarily the time of the Senate in discussing this question. What I want is to have the employees of the War Risk Insurance Bureau put on the same plane as to salary as the employees of other bureaus of the Government. I know it is contended that when these clerks were employed their salaries were fixed so as to include the \$120 allowance made last year in the appropriation bill to the regular statutory employees of the Government, but I do not think these clerks were employed with any such understanding.

I wish to read two telegrams that were sent to clerks appointed in the War Risk Insurance Bureau to show that there was no indication of that kind given to them. Here is a telegram sent out on September 11, reading as follows:

Appointed clerk, Bureau of War Risk Insurance, New National Museum, Tenth and B Streets, \$1,100 per annum. Report immediately, or before September 20. Services urgently needed. Early promotion, if service proves satisfactory. Wire.

The person who received that telegram reported, was employed at \$1,100, has received no increase, and is still working for the bureau.

I read another telegram, dated September 14, which is as follows:

Appointed typist, \$1,100 per annum, War Risk Insurance. Chance of promotion, if merited, good. Wire earliest can report at destination. Service urgently needed.

That young lady reported. She started to work at \$1,100 and is still drawing \$1,100. It will be seen that a promise of promotion was offered, but it has not been kept; and yet in this bill, instead of getting the allowance that has been given to other Government clerks, the employees of the War Risk Insurance Bureau are only given one-half. I hope the amendment offered by me will be agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I desire to say that there is no item in this bill to which the subcommittee in charge of it gave more careful consideration than this item in reference to the bonus to the employees of the War Risk Insurance Bureau. It was left out of the bill last year, for the reason that it has been the policy of the Congress in adopting this

bonus not to apply it to those bureaus that were entirely war emergency bureaus, and the committee last year had the idea that the War Risk Insurance Bureau was of that class, although so far as the insurance features of that bureau are concerned it becomes a permanent bureau.

The reason the distinction was made between the old bureaus and departments of the Government and the war emergency bureaus which were established here, was that the clerks in the emergency bureaus were paid out of a lump sum; there was no limitation; there was no statutory provision for those temporary clerks; and undoubtedly they were paid a great deal more salary than the clerks in the regular bureaus. The effort of the Congress and of the committees of Congress was to equalize those salaries, to take care of the statutory clerks whose salaries were not increased and of the clerks in the old bureaus employed under lump-sum appropriations who were on the same basis.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. Does not the Senator think that the fact that these clerks received telegrams stating that they were appointed at \$1,100, and that there would be early promotion, entitles them to some consideration?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think that alone should determine the matter. We could not increase the clerical force of the Government and their salaries to an amount perhaps of \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 a year because the head of a bureau wired one or two clerks that, if they would come here, he would give them an increase over their initial salary. That would be an impossible proposition. It might have been a very unjust thing for the head of the bureau to have done; but it would not justify Congress in giving a general increase all along the line. However, that is not my argument.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I merely want to make one suggestion, if the Senator will permit me. I will not take up any of the Senator's time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I only read two telegrams, but I had at least 50 clerks, who were employed at \$1,100, tell me that they had received similar telegrams.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That may be; but I want to come to the real details. Young ladies employed in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance came before the committee and urged this increase. They all believed they were getting smaller salaries than anybody else—I have no doubt about that—because they could point to a clerk here or a clerk there in some other department or bureau who was getting more salary than they did; but we sent for the heads of this bureau and examined them, and also had a report from the efficiency commission of the Government, and we found that their salaries last year were placed on a basis to equalize the increase of \$120 which we gave to the statutory clerks. Unless we are willing to reject the testimony of Mr. Brown, the head of the Efficiency Bureau of the Government, whom we sent down there to look into this matter and report to us, we must believe that these clerks got that \$120 last year by reason of its being provided in the lump-sum appropriation that was made to run the bureau.

Mr. SMOOT. One hundred and twenty-nine dollars was the actual average.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator from Utah calls my attention to the fact that the actual amount which they got by way of increase was \$129. That being the case, if the Senate gave them the entire increase of \$240 carried in this bill, instead of equalizing their salaries with the salaries of other clerks of the Government on the statutory roll, we would be putting them \$120 above the other clerks. We have attempted to equalize the salaries. We have carefully examined the facts, and there was not a dissenting voice in the committee as to what the result was after we heard the testimony. I am absolutely certain, from the testimony, that if we let this bill remain as it is, we put the clerks in the War Risk Insurance Bureau on exactly the same basis of pay as the average pay in the general statutory bureaus of the Government.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKellar in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I merely wish to correct one statement the Senator made. I think the Senator meant there was not a dissenting voice in the subcommittee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is what I meant.

Mr. CURTIS. The amendment which I offered in the full committee did have two or three votes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator is correct. The full committee did not make the investigation.

Mr. CURTIS. That is true.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It was made by the subcommittee, and the subcommittee reached a united verdict on it. This question involves a number of millions of dollars. It is a question which your committee investigated and on which it called for expert testimony. I do not think there is any doubt about it; and I think the Senate ought to reject the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator a question, for this matter has been called to my attention a good many times. I understood the Senator from Alabama to say—and I intend to accept what he says with regard to it—that with the provisions of this bill as they are, the clerks in the War Risk Insurance Bureau will be getting just as much pay as the clerks in the other departments for the same kind of work.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They will be getting the same basis of pay. Of course, there is a variation as to individuals.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But as to the basis of pay, they will be put on an identical basis with the statutory clerks in the Government employ now, with the bonus added.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have had a great desire to have all of the employees of the Government receive equal treatment under this provision. The bill passed the House with no mention whatever of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, as it was not provided for in the bill a year ago. The Bureau of War Risk Insurance, when it began to employ clerks, typists, and stenographers shortly after its organization, paying them out of a lump sum, paid higher wages than most any other department of the Government. Senators know themselves that they lost their own clerks; they were taken away from them; and many of them went to the War Risk Insurance Bureau. In the investigation a year ago it developed that they were paid higher salaries than the clerks in many of the other departments when the clerks in the other departments were paid an additional amount of \$120, as they were a year ago.

When the House passed the pending bill, as I said, they gave a \$240 increase instead of the \$120 which was given a year ago; but they still left out the War Risk Insurance Bureau, and we began an investigation as to whether that was fair to that bureau. It developed—and I have the figures here to prove it—that between the passage of the legislative bill for the present fiscal year and the present time there has been an average increase of \$129 in the salaries of employees in that bureau. That increase was made upon the order of the head of the department of which the bureau is a part. The Bureau of Efficiency, with Mr. Brown at its head, went into the whole question. I have here a long statement, which I do not wish to burden the Senate with at this time, showing that that increase was made; and not only that, but it is now agreed that there shall be further increases in the bureau after a service of three months.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. CURTIS. Those increases have not been given. I have read 2 telegrams on the subject, and I could have read 50 more.

Mr. SMOOT. No matter whether this provision is adopted or not, they are going to receive the agreed increases. If the Senator doubts it, I have here a statement from the Bureau of Efficiency stating just what the agreement was and how the salaries should be increased.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, are these all temporary salaries?

Mr. SMOOT. They are all paid out of a lump sum.

Mr. TOWNSEND. But are they temporary—for one year?

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. LODGE. They are not statutory clerks.

Mr. SMOOT. They are not statutory salaries. They are fixed by the bureau at the time they are employed.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. FLETCHER. Do I understand the Senator to say that within three months the employees of this bureau will be receiving the same as the employees of other bureaus?

Mr. SMOOT. They will receive the same as the other employees will receive if the others get the \$240 increase, and the employees in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance get only the \$120. That \$120, given to the employees of the War Risk Bu-

reau, places them upon an equality with the others, as nearly as it is possible to place the employees of all of the departments of our Government upon an equality.

I know that the employees of the bureau say that the average compensation in that bureau is not as high as in the Department of Justice, or the Federal Trade Commission, or the Quartermaster General's Department, or the Department of Commerce. That is very easily accounted for. There are over 5,500 employees in the War Risk Insurance Bureau drawing a salary of \$1,100; or, in other words, they are all employees from typists down. I have here a letter from the Civil Service Commission in which it is stated that many of those employees receiving \$1,080 are doing work that requires no preparation and no particular ability, and therefore the Civil Service Commission think the salaries they are receiving now, if the \$120 is added, will be ample.

Every young lady who appeared before the committee who was asked what salary she was receiving was receiving over \$1,300, and with the \$120 added it means that they will be receiving about \$1,450 a year; and there are a great many of them. I could go into the details and tell just exactly how many there are, but I believe enough has been said to show the Senate that the committee wanted to do the right thing by all of the employees of the Government.

If an effort should be made upon the part of any Senator to increase the \$240 bonus to \$360, then, of course, of necessity, the \$120 increase for the War Risk Insurance Bureau ought to be increased to \$240. That should be done in case the other bonus is increased to \$360.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. I will state that I made an investigation and came to the same conclusion that the committee did; but I should like to ask the Senator whether he has information there as to the lowest salaries paid in this bureau?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I can tell the Senator in just a few moments what they are, and there are only a few of the employees who are receiving less than \$1,100. I will run through this statement, and tell, in a moment, just what departments they are in.

The filers in the section of correspondence are receiving \$1,140. Whatever filers there are are receiving to-day \$1,140.

The typists in the same section are receiving \$1,140.

The sorters—that is, the incoming sorters, meaning those who sort the mail as it comes into the section—receive \$1,080; and the sorters on the outgoing mail, where it is distributed to the desks of the heads who handle it in detail, receive \$1,140.

In the claims division the typists receive \$1,140, and they are the only employees in that whole division who receive less than \$1,200.

Mr. LENROOT. Has the Senator a memorandum there of any that receive a salary of \$660?

Mr. SMOOT. I will run through them and see.

There are the graphotype operators, who receive \$900; the miscellaneous mail clerks receive \$1,080; the numbering clerks receive \$1,080; the dropping and stitching clerks receive \$1,080; and the punchers receive \$900.

Mr. LENROOT. Is it the Senator's understanding that that is the lowest salary that is paid in the bureau?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that that is the lowest salary that is being paid in the bureau to-day.

Mr. SMOOT subsequently said: I ask that following my statement made a few moments ago to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum furnished by the head of the Bureau of Efficiency in relation to just what has been done in the way of increased salaries in the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Memorandum.

JANUARY 24, 1919.

At the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations of the House last year, the representatives of the Bureau of Efficiency and the Bureau of War Risk Insurance promised the committee that they would fix standard salaries for the different kinds of work performed in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and pay the employees according to the value of their services as nearly as that value could be determined. This work was undertaken by representatives of the Bureau of Efficiency, and the standard salaries were designated. These standard salaries were submitted first to officers of the War Risk Insurance Bureau and later to representatives of the House Committee on Appropriations. In most cases this standardization has resulted in raising the pay of employees engaged on the different kinds of work.

Entrance salaries of \$1,000 for clerks and typists and \$1,100 for stenographers were fixed by officers of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance last spring. At about the same time the entrance salary for clerks and typists was raised by the War Department to \$1,100 and for stenographers to \$1,200, with a promise of an automatic promotion of \$100 at the end of three months' service. This created dissatisfaction among the employees of the Bureau of War Risk In-

surance and since the classification work required considerable time it was finally decided by the Bureau of Efficiency in the early part of August to recommend that an automatic increase be given to all employees of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance who had been in the bureau three months and who had not been promoted. This increase was made effective August 16. A little later great difficulty was experienced in securing satisfactory eligibles from the Civil Service register at the entrance salaries offered by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and with a view to overcoming this difficulty, the Bureau of Efficiency recommended that the entrance salary of clerks and typists be raised from \$1,000 to \$1,100, and of stenographers from \$1,100 to \$1,200. This recommendation was also adopted. Shortly after this a third recommendation was made that any clerks and typists who had been appointed by the bureau at less than \$1,100, and any stenographers who had been appointed at less than \$1,200 and who were receiving less than those salaries should be promoted to those salaries. This recommendation was also adopted. These various recommendations were made because it was found that under the classification these blanket increases would in very few cases raise the pay of the employees above the standards that were being prepared. In the early part of September the Bureau of Efficiency began to submit to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance its standard salaries for the different kinds of work. These were generally adopted and promotions under them put into effect. These standards are shown in the tables appended to this memorandum. In many cases the promotions made under these standards did not bring the clerks up to the standards because it was felt that at the first rating no one should be promoted more than \$240 a year, no one should be promoted to more than the standard salary for the work he was doing, and no one should be promoted who had not been in the bureau at least three months.

On July 1 the average salary of employees in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance was \$1,017. The average salary on December 1 was \$1,119, or an increase of \$102. This increase was due to the blanket promotions, to the raising of entrance salaries, and to the increases under the standard salaries that had been adopted by the bureau. Since December 1 further standard salaries have been submitted to the bureau that, when adopted and promotions made under them, will bring the average salary up to \$1,141, or an average increase of \$124.

The question to be considered is whether or not the blanket increase of \$240 or some other amount should be granted to the employees of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. In fixing the standard salaries shown in the accompanying schedules, the Bureau of Efficiency endeavored to take into account the increased cost of living, the compensation paid in other offices of the Government and in commercial establishments, and these standards are intended to correspond to the pay in other offices of the Government where the bonus of \$120 is paid. An examination of the standard salary schedules attached will aid in determining what bonus should be given the employees in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

It should be stated that because of the rule which was adopted that no promotion should be made until an employee had served at least three months, and that no promotion should be made of more than \$240 at one time, there are still thousands of persons in the bureau who are receiving less than the standard pay fixed for the kinds of work they are performing. Under the rules laid down for fixing the value of the services of employees a clerk performing a quantity and quality of work far above the standard might be paid more than the standard salary, but since the first ratings were made in great haste, and were therefore more or less imperfect, the rule was adopted that no promotion above the standard salary should be made at the first rating.

The salaries have been standardized and promotions made under them in the following divisions: Allotments and allowances, accounts, actuarial, and compensation and claims. The standard salaries, and recommendations for promotions under them, have been submitted in the following offices, but so far as we are informed the promotions have not yet been made: Administrative, insurance, legal, and receipts and disbursements.

The increases that have been made in the salaries paid to employees in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance since last July have amounted to more than a million dollars a year. The recommendations already made, but which have not yet been acted on by the bureau, will bring this amount up to \$1,300,000 a year. With subsequent ratings under these standard salaries, this amount will be still further increased. The amount of this increase can not be stated at this time.

JANUARY 24, 1919.

BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE, ACCOUNTING DIVISION.

DESCRIPTION OF WORK BY POSITIONS.

1. Adding-machine operator, \$1,140: Lists amounts on adding machine and gets total. No discretion, no judgment.
2. Adjuster, first grade, \$1,500: Adjusts the amount of an award in case of death, discontinuance, duplication, or changes in family relations. Has to understand the law and be good at figures.
3. Adjuster, second grade, \$1,320: Makes adjustments in amounts allowed for insurance and compensation in case of changes. Cases simpler than amendment or death cases.
4. Adjuster of progress cards, \$1,320: Really a third-grade bookkeeper. Located in disbursing office. Adjusts totals on progress cards if errors are discovered there. Sends information to bookkeeping division.
5. Bookkeeper, first grade, \$1,620: Is responsible for helping the administrative accounts and for the register, payments on awards, and allotments and allowances. Checks these against the card of the disbursing office.
6. Bookkeeper, second grade, \$1,440: Assists first-grade bookkeeper. Engaged in actually keeping the records of the bookkeeping department. Registers allotment and allowance, showing unit numbers, and gets grand total of amounts authorized.
7. Bookkeeper, third grade, \$1,380: Work similar to that of grade 2, but with less responsibility.
8. Bookkeeping-machine operator, \$1,380: Operates the Underwood and Burroughs machines. Requires headwork and a knowledge of bookkeeping.
9. Building superintendent and supply clerk, \$1,500: Looks after buildings and has charge of supplies. About same grade of work as a secretary.
10. Cancellation clerk, \$1,260: Makes out orders upon disbursing office to cancel payment of checks returned.
11. Computing-machine operator, \$1,320: Operates comptometer and Burroughs machines. More difficult than adding machines. Requires headwork and special training.
12. Correspondent's assistant, \$1,320: Reads over the letters written by dictators for errors of content and form.

13. Dictator or correspondence clerk, \$1,500: Dictates letters relative to adjustments. Must understand the making of adjustments as well as the use of English. Rarely uses form paragraphs.

14. File clerk, \$1,140: Arranges and lists returned checks and compares them with the application to see if there has been a change in address or name.

15. File clerk, \$1,140: Files correspondence alphabetically.

16. Filer and searcher, \$1,200: Files award cards serially; checks changes of address, amendments, stop payments, etc. Prepares and inserts flash cards. Posts numbers of checks actually certified for payment.

17. Mail clerk (mail sorter), \$1,140: Receives incoming mail and distributes it.

18. Planning clerk, \$1,320: Lists cases on a route sheet and forwards route sheet to certain sections and certain clerks. Receives the reports of these searchers. Keeps a record of just where a case is.

19. Poster, \$1,140: Posts amounts on record cards in cases where addressograph plates have not yet been made.

20. Principal file clerk, \$1,320: Instructs a group of 6 or 10 girls and oversees their work. Must have had considerable experience.

21. Progress-card clerk, \$1,200: Keeps a record of units of work which are sent over to the disbursing office under a progress card. Really a record clerk.

22. Receiving and shipping clerk, \$1,320: Is responsible for all award cards, etc., sent to and from the Accounting Division.

23. Record clerk, \$1,200: Keeps a record of units of work which are sent over to the disbursing officer under a progress card. Same as progress-card clerk.

24. Reviewer, first grade, \$1,620: Reviews the work of adjusters for errors in their decisions.

25. Reviewer, second grade, \$1,380: Reviews the work of adjusters for errors in their decisions.

26. Searcher, \$1,260: Especially good file clerk, who handles cases requiring immediate attention and careful and painstaking search.

27. Secretary, \$1,500: Takes charge of correspondence, arranges interviews, and relieves officers of routine work.

28. Sorter, \$1,140: Sorts work into units of 100.

29. Special adjusters, \$1,620: Experienced adjusters, who handle the difficult cases.

30. Special searcher, trouble chaser, investigator, \$1,320: Collect all available information on a certain case. Involves searching several sets of files in and out of the Accounting Division.

31. Stenographer, \$1,320: Takes and transcribes dictation.

32. Timekeeper (division), \$1,440: Is responsible for the time records of the entire Accounting Division.

33. Time clerk (section), \$1,200: Keeps the time records for one section or unit. Is responsible to division timekeeper.

34. Transportation clerk, \$1,440: Keeps the actual records of travel authorizations. Really a second-grade bookkeeper. Is responsible to transportation and travel expenses clerk.

35. Transportation and travel expenses clerk, \$2,040: Is responsible for the issue and record of travel authorizations.

36. Typist, \$1,140: Types material ready for transcribing or record.

37. Verifier, \$1,200: Checks the work of typists or other recording clerks.

NOVEMBER 29, 1918.

BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE, ACTUARIAL DIVISION.

DESCRIPTION OF WORK BY POSITIONS.

1. Supervisor, \$1,800, \$1,680: Has charge of all the clerks or operators and the direction of all the work in one section. Responsible for putting out the work of the section.

2. Subsupervisor, \$1,320: Has charge of the clerks and the work of a smaller division than a section; i. e., a unit. Works under the direction of the supervisor.

3. Personnel clerk, \$1,380. Keeps record of the employees of the division—time, absence, efficiency records, etc.

4. Record clerk (coding section), \$1,200: Keeps record of work assigned and performed by the clerks in the section; makes up the daily report of work done by the section.

5. Clerk (graphic representation unit), \$1,200: Under the direction of the chief, assembles and prepares data for presentation in charts or tables.

6. Change clerk (coding section), \$1,200: Makes changes in code slips and cards when information respecting cases change.

7. Coder, \$1,200: Prepares, from information received from other divisions of the bureau, the code slips to guide the card punchers in their work.

8. Tabulator, \$1,140: Operates the tabulating machines.

9. Verifier (punching and tabulating section), \$1,140: Reviews the work of the card punchers to see that it is correct.

10. Card puncher, \$900: Operates the Hollerith card-punching machine. Punches cards according to directions on the code slips.

JANUARY 21, 1919.

BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE, ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION.

DESCRIPTION OF POSITIONS.

1. Assistant pay clerk, \$1,800: Is in immediate charge of making up the pay roll for all sections; has charge of the distribution of checks as well as general supervisory duties.

2. Special supervisor (appointments), \$1,500: Handles special work directly under the supervision of the chief of appointments; handles original correspondence and supervises routine work.

3. Supervisor personnel index (appointments), \$1,500: Is responsible for the personnel register of employees. This must be absolutely accurate, as all pay rolls are checked by this index.

4. Statistical clerk (paymaster), \$1,440: Is responsible for making up the pay rolls of the different sections. Checks the roll, enters all deductions, makes all calculations, and handles transfers and adjustments. Requires accounting training.

5. Supervisor of index and mails (appointments), \$1,440: In charge of the personnel files and of the distribution of incoming and outgoing mail.

6. Assistant statistical clerk (paymaster), \$1,320: Operates adding machine and comptometer and assists in making up the pay rolls.

7. Stenographer, \$1,320: Takes and transcribes dictation and looks after routine work.

8. Supervisor of civil-service records (appointments), \$1,320: In charge of the filing of civil-service certificates and the keeping of the card records pertaining thereto.

9. Adjuster (time), \$1,260: Handles all complaints of employees dissatisfied with the amount of money deducted from their pay; makes proper adjustments of salaries when resignations occur. Requires thorough knowledge of all time regulations.

10. Applications examiner (time), \$1,200: Examines applications for sick or annual leave to see that they are in proper form and that the time requested is not in excess of the amount due.

11. Change of address clerk (mail), \$1,200: Receives letters indicating a change of address but not containing sufficient information. Sends out insufficient information forms to the writers to obtain more information.

12. Estimator (time), \$1,200: Estimates the amount of sick and annual leave due an employee.

13. Mail distributor, \$1,200: Arranges letters by sections and keeps a record of the number of letters going to each section.

14. Mail reader, \$1,200: Reads letters to determine to what division they should be sent.

15. Miscellaneous clerk, \$1,200: Assists in work of personnel or civil-service records. Requires more judgment than filing.

16. Record clerk, \$1,200: Makes permanent records of time, mail, etc. Requires absolute accuracy.

17. Mail and file clerk, \$1,140: Files applications alphabetically and sorts mail.

18. Mail opener, \$1,140: Receives mail from cutting machine, extracts contents, pins them together, and stamps them.

19. Mail sorter, \$1,140: Arranges mail by sections or by States.

20. Typist, \$1,140: Types cards and other material ready for record.

DESCRIPTION OF WORK IN THE ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCE DIVISION, AWARDING SECTION.

1. Sorters, \$1,140: Classify applications according to date and name, and then according to awards or "nones" and class of service. Sorters also write post cards.

2. Numerers, \$1,140: Affix the award numbers on applications.

3. Distributors, \$1,140: Sort outgoing material by name or designation for proper future disposition. Arrange award cards and applications numerically.

4. Typists, \$1,140: Write the award cards and index cards. Requires great accuracy and ability to read awards. Typists in duplicate section make special award index cards and lists for disbursing office.

5. Verifiers, \$1,200: Checking work of typists. If they notice errors in awards they check those also, but their real work is correcting errors in typing.

6. Awarders, \$1,500: Decide whether award should be made and make the award, determining the amount, the allottee, whether the person named is old enough to receive checks, etc., and if necessary institute correspondence as soon as possible in regard to it. Must know article 2 of the act and how to operate thereunder.

Awarders in the duplicate section are really reawarders. Standard salary, \$1,620.

7. Reviewers, \$1,620: Review awards to make sure that the case is handled properly and that award is correct.

8. Examiners, \$1,200: Examine applications for wrong addresses and correct when necessary. May also check errors in awards.

9. Adjusters, duplicate section, \$1,620: Adjust two awards where they have been made to the same person. Has to have a knowledge of the operations in the accounts section in addition to those in index and application files.

10. Duplicate section, duplicate workers, \$1,320: Trace and match duplicate applications; must be experts in files and index.

11. Other positions are described in the memorandum accompanying the recommendations respecting the correspondence and index files sections. Some miscellaneous positions are only tentatively standardized; final classification is reserved until survey of whole bureau is completed.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1918.

SEPTEMBER 5, 1918.

DESCRIPTIONS OF WORK IN THE ALLOTMENT AND ALLOWANCE DIVISION—SECTIONS OF CORRESPONDENCE, STOP PAYMENT, RED CROSS, SERIAL NUMBER, EMERGENCY, WIVES' APPLICATIONS, NO CARD, AND INDEX FILES.

1. Unit supervisor, \$1,800: Has general duties of supervising and operating unit of an average of 30 persons. Assigns clerks, issues instructions, passes, and leaves of absence. Responsible to chief of section.

2. Examining board, \$1,680: Special examiners of the work of reawarders and correspondents which have passed the reviewers and examiners. The chief purpose is to correct the mistakes, count the errors, and prevent an illegal application of the law.

3. Instructors of examiners, \$1,620: Supervise the work of examiners and reviewers and instruct them in the proper use of material for correspondence and reawards.

4. Examiners of correspondence, \$1,620; reviewers of reawards, \$1,620: Examine and review all correspondence and reawards to make sure that the case is covered properly by form letter paragraphs and that the reaward is correct.

5. Assistant supervisor, \$1,560 and \$1,620: Relieves the supervisor in duties of the unit. Sometimes supervises a particular portion of work of the unit.

6. Reawarders, \$1,500. Change the status of the original application upon notice of death, birth, becoming of age, or other change in the family of the applicant.

7. Special form letter writer, \$1,500: Prepares the proper form paragraphs for use in the correspondence units.

8. Reviser, \$1,500: Verifies filing of cards and drops them below the rod. Instructs the filers and maintains the accuracy of the files.

9. Adjuster, \$1,300: Makes adjustment in a stop-payment case after search in correspondence. Changes the application and makes a proper report to the audit division.

10. Special dictator, \$1,440: Dictates letters in cases in which prepared form paragraphs are insufficient to cover inquiry.

11. Trouble chaser, \$1,380: Takes care of no-card cases, kills duplicate cards, distributes flash cards where no card is found, corrects all inaccuracies in the files.

12. Form letter writer or correspondent, \$1,380: Uses prepared paragraph forms to answer correspondence by filling in proper material to cover case.

13. Stenographer, \$1,320: One who is able to take and transcribe dictation.

14. Principal file clerk, \$1,320: In immediate charge of a group of filers on application and correspondence files.

15. Recorder, \$1,260: Makes a record of application number of all cases where stop payments have been forwarded to audit division.
16. Route clerk, \$1,260: Assigns work to particular workers for proper attention.
17. Subsupervisor, \$1,200: General duties of a supervisor of a smaller unit of work and responsible to assistant supervisor for carrying out instructions and producing maximum output.
18. Searcher, \$1,200: Looks up cases needing immediate attention, accurate and painstaking search, or which require search through the records of several units or divisions of the bureau.
19. Readers, \$1,200: Read mail and attach face sheet designating course to be taken and reply to be sent.
20. Verifiers, \$1,200: Checking work of typists or other recording clerks.
21. Statistical clerk, \$1,200: Keeps quantity and quality records and other information on work received and disposed of by the unit.
22. Stenographer-typist, \$1,200: One who is usually acting as a typist, but may take dictation in a special emergency.
23. Filer, \$1,140: Inserts applications and correspondence, index cards, etc., in proper place in file.
24. Typist, \$1,140: One who types material already prepared for transcribing or record (no discretion required).
25. Sorters, incoming, \$1,080; outgoing, \$1,140: Sort incoming material by simple method of name or designation for proper attention of correspondents or index clerks and resort to proper sections after action has been taken.

NOVEMBER 1, 1918.

BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE, COMPENSATION AND CLAIM DIVISION.
DESCRIPTION OF WORK.

1. Supervisor, \$1,440 and \$1,500: General duty of supervising the work of a section; e. g., files, typists, stenographers, assign clerks, issues instructions, etc.
2. Assistant supervisor, \$1,320 and \$1,380: Relieves the supervisor in his duties or supervises a particular portion of the work of the section or group.
3. Subsupervisor, \$1,260: Responsible to the supervisor for the work of a small group.
4. Examiner, \$1,800: Collects and examines evidence necessary to adjudicate a claim and make a recommendation for an award. Must have legal training. Persons with experience in handling compensation claims for insurance companies preferred.
5. Reviewer, \$2,100: Reviews the evidence and approves or disapproves the recommendation of the examiners. Same training and experience as for examiners.
6. Statistical clerk, \$1,440: Works up statistics of deaths, disabilities, etc., from the daily records. Furnishes the data for the actuarial division.
7. Record clerk, \$1,320: Keeps records of all insurance cases, compensation cases, etc., and furnishes reports on same to various officers of the bureau weekly.
8. Stenographer, \$1,320: Takes and transcribes dictation. In a few instances writes letters on own responsibility.
9. Secretary, \$1,500: Acts as secretary to heads of division and sections and other executive officers; performs service to relieve supervisors of detail and routine work.
10. Mail examiner, \$1,500: Reads and sorts mail for distribution to the appropriate sections; indicates the nature of the reply in many cases; in some cases makes the reply on own responsibility.
11. Card-index file clerk, \$1,200: Keep the index to the cases. File and search.
12. Case file clerk, \$1,200: Keep the case files themselves. File and search.
13. Typists, \$1,140: Types material already prepared for transcribing or record (no discretion required).

BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE, DISBURSING DIVISION.
DESCRIPTION OF POSITIONS.

1. Information clerk, \$1,320: Meet the public, answer questions by telephone; have to understand the work of the division.
2. Mail sorter, \$1,140: Sorting mail by State or for distribution within the Disbursing Division.
3. Division master, \$1,500: Distributes the checks for the entire Disbursing Division.
4. Division timekeeper, \$1,440: Keeps the records of time for all people in the division.
5. Stenographer-typist, \$1,200: One who is employed mostly in typing, but who may take dictation in an emergency.
6. Record clerk, \$1,200: Keeps records of incoming and outgoing units of work.
7. Instructor of verifiers, \$1,260: Gives the verifiers verbal instructions and answers questions.
8. Verifier, \$1,200: Check the work of typists and graphotype operators.
9. File clerk, \$1,140: File material alphabetically or by number.
10. Adding-machine operator, \$1,140: List amounts on the adding machine and get totals; requires accuracy.
11. Bookkeeper, \$1,440: Keeps a record of the transactions of the Miscellaneous Disbursements Section.
12. Stenographer, \$1,320: Takes and transcribes dictation.
13. Bookkeeping-machine operator, \$1,320: Operates the automatic bookkeeping machines; requires a knowledge of bookkeeping and special training.
14. Addressograph operator, \$1,200: Manipulates the machine which addresses checks from the plates cut by graphotype operators.
15. Miscellaneous-mail clerks, \$1,080: Stuff and seal envelopes.
16. Graphotype operators, \$900: Operate the machines which cut the addressograph plates; takes no special training.
17. Correspondence clerk (dictator), \$1,500: Answers correspondence on own responsibility.
18. Foreign-mail clerk, \$1,200: Have charge of sorting, stamping, and recording all foreign mail.
19. Signagraph operator, \$1,140: Operates the machines whereby checks are signed in groups; requires a good handwriting, a short name, and some experience.

JANUARY 24, 1919.

BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE, INSURANCE DIVISION.
DESCRIPTION OF POSITIONS.

1. Insurance, expert (civil relief), \$1,800: Reviews the work of examiners, answers correspondence, decides technical questions. Must have had previous insurance training.

2. Executive clerk and supervisor of personnel, \$1,800: Responsible for assigning clerks to a particular kind of work and for keeping a record of personnel. Also supervises the welfare work.
3. Correspondence clerk (dictator), \$1,500: Composes and dictates letters or indicates form paragraphs to be used. Form paragraphs rarely used.
4. Secretary, \$1,500: Acts as secretary to division heads, takes care of correspondence, etc., and relieves them of detail and routine work.
5. Division paymaster, \$1,500: Responsible for distributing the pay checks for the entire Insurance Division.
6. Reviewers (Claims Division), \$1,500: Make the final examination of a claim before it is certified for payment. Must be thoroughly familiar with the law.
7. Timekeeper (division), \$1,500: Responsible for the time records of the entire division. Has assistants in the various sections.
8. Reviser (index-card file), \$1,320: Verifies filing of cards, decides when errors have been made and how they should be corrected. Is responsible for the accuracy of the files.
9. Stenographer, \$1,320: Takes and transcribes dictation.
10. Photostat operators, \$1,320: Operate the machines used in making blue prints. Requires experience in exposures as well as in operating the machines.
11. Reviewers (premium accounting), \$1,320: Review the work of examiners and decide that the amount of the premium is correct or incorrect.
12. Examiners (claims), \$1,320: Examine applications for claims for insurance to see whether they should be paid.
13. Duplicate clerks, \$1,260: When two cards are found for the same person duplicate workers decide which is correct, getting their information from the change section. Requires absolute accuracy.
14. Change clerks, \$1,260: Decide what insurance numbers are to be used when two applications have been made by the same person. Furnish the information for the duplicate clerks.
15. Registrars, \$1,260: Compare the certificate with the record card, register the numbers, and sign the certificates.
16. Time clerk, \$1,200: Keeps the time records of people in one section.
17. Adding-machine operator (numbering section), \$1,200: Takes averages as well as operating the adding machines.
18. Verifier, \$1,200: Checks the work of typists for errors.
19. Filer and searcher, \$1,200: Inserts material in the file and searches.
20. Mail distributor, \$1,200: Arranges correspondence alphabetically for the index-card section and rearranges it for distribution back to the sections after it has been used there. Has to understand the work of the various sections.
21. Record clerk, \$1,200: Makes a permanent record of applications or work sent in and out of a section or of the daily production of each clerk.
22. Telautograph operator, \$1,140: Operates the machine upon which requests for information are written to and received from other divisions. Requires a good handwriting, ability to brief, and some experience.
23. Verifier (numbering), \$1,140: Check the work of the automatic numbering machines.
24. Typist, \$1,140: Writing record and index cards and copying miscellaneous material.
25. Mail sorter, \$1,140: Sort material alphabetically or by States.
26. File clerk, \$1,140: Arrange material alphabetically or by number and insert it in the files.
27. Numbering clerks, \$1,080: Operate the automatic numbering machines.
28. Miscellaneous mail clerks, \$1,080: Fold certificates and letters and insert them in the envelopes.
29. Dropping and stitching clerks, \$1,080: Staple applications and correspondence into the folders.

JANUARY 10, 1919.

BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE, LEGAL DIVISION.
DESCRIPTION OF WORK BY POSITIONS.

1. Supervisor, \$1,620, \$1,500, \$1,440: Has charge of all clerks or operators doing a particular kind of work and is responsible for putting out that work. The number of people for whom the supervisors are responsible and the difficulty of the work performed determine the grade under which they are classed.
2. Assistant supervisor, \$1,500, \$1,380, \$1,320: Assists the supervisor in the direction of the work of all clerks.
3. Subsupervisor, \$1,320: Has charge of one group of clerks under the direction of the supervisor and assistant supervisor.
4. Statistical clerk, \$1,320: Under the direction of the supervisor, compiling, checking, and tabulating economic and social statistics of individuals concerned in cases covered by the Legal Division.
5. Law clerk, \$1,620: Assists counsels and attorneys in assembling and preparation of cases.
6. Secretary, \$1,500: Acts as secretary to counsels, takes charge of correspondence, appointments, etc., and relieves them of detail and routine work.
7. Special searcher, \$1,320: Searches files of all divisions for information on cases. Must be familiar with organization of entire bureau and an expert in files.
8. Stenographer, \$1,320: Takes and transcribes dictation of the counsels and attorneys.
9. Calendar clerk, \$1,260: Looks after cases going to and coming from the courts. Sees that evidence is properly assembled and arranged for use of the attorneys.
10. Instructor, \$1,260: Prepares written instructions for typists and verifies all work of typists.
11. File clerk, \$1,200: Inserts material in the file, indexes material, and searches.
12. Mail distributor, \$1,200: Arranges mail for distribution to various offices. Has to be thoroughly familiar with the work and organization of the Legal Division.
13. Typist, \$1,140: Types material prepared for transcribing or record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is upon the committee amendment as reported.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator having charge of the bill what the aggregate amount

of this increase of salaries will be if the bill passes with the committee amendment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I suppose that this matter had better go into the RECORD officially. I send to the desk and ask to have read by the Secretary a letter from Mr. Herbert D. Brown, chief of the Bureau of Efficiency, stating the facts in answer to the Senator's question, as I have already asked Mr. Brown the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES BUREAU OF EFFICIENCY,
Washington, February 4, 1919.

Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR UNDERWOOD: You asked me this morning over the telephone to make an estimate of the cost to the Government of granting an allowance of \$240 or \$360 a year in lieu of the \$120 allowance which is now being paid to employees of the Government.

Attached to this letter is a statement which we prepared last year showing our estimate of the cost of the \$120 provision now in force. This statement shows that we estimated at that time that the \$120 provision would cover 263,300 people and that the total cost of the \$120 provision would amount to \$31,500,000, including the cost of the allowance to members of the Postal Service but not to employees of the arsenals, navy yards, Panama Canal, and Alaskan Railway. Excluding the Postal Service, we estimated that the provision would cover 123,200 employees and that the total cost would be \$14,600,000. As the provision was finally adopted, the members of the Postal Service were excluded.

Attached to this letter is also a statement from the Treasury Department which shows that for the six months ending December 31, 1918, the actual expenditures on account of the \$120 provision amounted to \$7,284,007. At this rate the total expenditures for the year would be \$14,568,000 or \$32,000 less than our estimate.

It is impossible within the time available to make a very careful analysis of the probable cost of the proposed bonus of \$240 a year but I believe that in most instances the number of employees included in our estimate of last year will not vary greatly during the ensuing year. On this assumption, the cost for the current year of \$14,600,000 should be doubled. This would bring the cost up to \$29,200,000. To this amount should be added the cost of whatever allowance is made to the employees of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. As I understand it, the employees of that bureau are to receive \$120 instead of \$240 because the allowance of \$120 for the current year is included in the standard salaries that have been adopted by the bureau. It is difficult to estimate the number of employees that will be required in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance during the fiscal year 1920, but if we assume the roll to include 13,000 people, then we should add \$1,560,000 to the \$29,200,000 mentioned above. This will bring the total cost of the \$240 increase up to \$30,760,000. I know of no other offices where large increases are likely to occur.

If increased compensation is granted employees at the rate of \$360, the cost of \$29,200,000 mentioned above would be increased by 50 per cent, or \$14,600,000, making a total of \$43,800,000. To this amount should be added \$3,120,000 (\$1,560,000 × 2) for the employees of the War Risk Bureau, or a grand total of \$46,920,000.

I have made no allowance for any reduction in the civilian clerical force of the War Department. A large reduction will be made in the clerical force of that department through the discharge of drafted men engaged on clerical work. The large amount of salvage and accounting work yet to be done by the department will probably make it necessary to keep all of the civilian clerks they now have.

Very truly, yours,

HERBERT D. BROWN,
Chief, Bureau of Efficiency.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to ask that the document which accompanies that letter be printed in the RECORD. I shall not take the time to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Estimated cost of proposed salary increases for the fiscal year 1919:

FLAT INCREASE OF \$120.

| Service. | Limiting salary, \$2,000. | | | Limiting salary, \$2,500. | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | In service from July 1, 1917. | In service from July 1, 1918. | No service restriction. | In service from July 1, 1917. | In service from July 1, 1918. | No service restriction. |
| Postal: | | | | | | |
| Persons..... | 129,000 | 133,800 | 145,400 | 129,300 | 140,100 | 145,600 |
| Cost..... | \$15,600,000 | \$16,901,000 | \$17,500,000 | \$15,600,000 | \$16,900,000 | \$17,600,000 |
| Per person..... | \$120 | \$120 | \$120 | \$120 | \$120 | \$120 |
| Other than Postal: | | | | | | |
| Persons..... | 189,000 | 233,700 | 252,900 | 195,700 | 238,900 | 261,900 |
| Cost..... | \$22,300,000 | \$27,200,000 | \$29,800,000 | \$23,100,000 | \$28,200,000 | \$30,900,000 |
| Per person..... | \$118 | \$118 | \$118 | \$118 | \$118 | \$118 |
| Total: | | | | | | |
| Persons..... | 318,000 | 370,500 | 398,300 | 325,000 | 379,000 | 407,500 |
| Cost..... | \$37,900,000 | \$44,100,000 | \$47,300,000 | \$38,700,000 | \$45,100,000 | \$48,500,000 |
| Per person..... | \$119 | \$119 | \$119 | \$119 | \$119 | \$119 |
| Arsenals, navy yards, Panama Canal, and Alaska Railway: | | | | | | |
| Persons..... | 83,400 | 111,700 | 126,900 | 86,300 | 115,700 | 131,400 |
| Cost..... | \$9,800,000 | \$13,100,000 | \$14,900,000 | \$10,200,000 | \$13,600,000 | \$15,500,000 |
| Per person..... | \$118 | \$118 | \$118 | \$118 | \$118 | \$118 |
| Total, excluding arsenals, etc.: | | | | | | |
| Persons..... | 234,600 | 258,800 | 271,400 | 238,700 | 263,300 | 276,100 |
| Cost..... | \$28,100,000 | \$31,000,000 | \$32,400,000 | \$28,500,000 | \$31,500,000 | \$33,000,000 |
| Per person..... | \$119 | \$119 | \$119 | \$119 | \$119 | \$119 |

¹ At salaries below \$400, \$480, and \$600, respectively, the increases are 30 per cent of the salaries. Salaries between \$2,000 and \$2,120 (or \$2,144 or \$2,180, as the case may be) to be increased to \$2,120 (or \$2,144 or \$2,180).

FLAT INCREASE OF \$144.

| | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Postal: | | | | | | |
| Persons..... | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Cost..... | \$18,700,000 | \$20,200,000 | \$21,000,000 | \$18,700,000 | \$20,300,000 | \$21,100,000 |
| Per person..... | \$144 | \$144 | \$144 | \$144 | \$144 | \$144 |
| Other than postal: | | | | | | |
| Persons..... | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Cost..... | \$26,400,000 | \$32,200,000 | \$35,300,000 | \$27,400,000 | \$33,400,000 | \$36,600,000 |
| Per person..... | \$140 | \$140 | \$140 | \$140 | \$140 | \$140 |
| Total: | | | | | | |
| Persons..... | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Cost..... | \$45,100,000 | \$52,400,000 | \$56,300,000 | \$46,100,000 | \$53,700,000 | \$57,700,000 |
| Per person..... | \$142 | \$142 | \$142 | \$142 | \$142 | \$142 |
| Arsenals, navy yards, Panama Canal, and Alaska Railway: | | | | | | |
| Persons..... | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Cost..... | \$11,600,000 | \$15,600,000 | \$17,300,000 | \$12,000,000 | \$16,100,000 | \$18,300,000 |
| Per person..... | \$140 | \$140 | \$140 | \$140 | \$140 | \$140 |
| Total, excluding arsenals, etc.: | | | | | | |
| Persons..... | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Cost..... | \$33,500,000 | \$36,800,000 | \$39,000,000 | \$34,100,000 | \$37,600,000 | \$39,400,000 |
| Per person..... | \$143 | \$143 | \$144 | \$143 | \$143 | \$143 |

¹ The number of persons in each group of this section is the same as in the corresponding group of the \$120 section.

FLAT INCREASES OF \$180.

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Postal: | | | | | | |
| Persons..... | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Cost..... | \$23,400,000 | \$25,400,000 | \$26,400,000 | \$23,500,000 | \$25,400,000 | \$26,400,000 |
| Per person..... | \$180 | \$180 | \$180 | \$180 | \$180 | \$180 |

¹ The number of persons in each group of this section is the same as in the corresponding group of the \$120 section.

Estimated cost of proposed salary increases for the fiscal year 1919—Continued.

FLAT INCREASE OF \$183—Continued.

| Service. | Limiting salary, \$2,000. | | | Limiting salary, \$2,500. | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | In service from July 1, 1917. | In service from July 1, 1918. | No service restriction. | In service from July 1, 1917. | In service from July 1, 1918. | No service restriction. |
| Other than postal: | | | | | | |
| Persons..... | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Cost..... | \$32,500,000 | \$39,600,000 | \$43,400,000 | \$33,700,000 | \$41,100,000 | \$45,000,000 |
| Per person..... | \$172 | \$172 | \$172 | \$172 | \$172 | \$172 |
| Total: | | | | | | |
| Persons..... | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Cost..... | \$55,900,000 | \$65,000,000 | \$69,800,000 | \$57,200,000 | \$66,500,000 | \$71,400,000 |
| Per person..... | \$177 | \$176 | \$176 | \$177 | \$176 | \$176 |
| Arsenals, navy yards, Panama Canal, and Alaska Railway: | | | | | | |
| Persons..... | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Cost..... | \$14,300,000 | \$19,200,000 | \$21,800,000 | \$14,900,000 | \$19,900,000 | \$22,600,000 |
| Per person..... | \$172 | \$172 | \$172 | \$172 | \$172 | \$172 |
| Total, excluding arsenals, etc.: | | | | | | |
| Persons..... | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Cost..... | \$41,600,000 | \$45,800,000 | \$48,000,000 | \$42,300,000 | \$46,600,000 | \$48,800,000 |
| Per person..... | \$178 | \$178 | \$178 | \$178 | \$178 | \$178 |

¹ The number of persons in each group of this section is the same as in the corresponding group of the \$120 section.

Disbursements to Nov. 30, 1918 (5 months), on account of increase of compensation, 1919.

| | To Nov. 30 | December (incomplete). |
|---|--------------|------------------------|
| Senate..... | \$35,000.00 | |
| House of Representatives..... | 28,900.00 | \$5,000.00 |
| Government Printing Office..... | 240,000.00 | 45,000.00 |
| Library of Congress..... | 25,500.00 | 4,500.00 |
| Botanic Garden..... | 1,950.00 | 450.00 |
| Lincoln Memorial Commission..... | 240.00 | |
| Commission on Memorial to Women of the Civil War..... | 30.00 | |
| Executive Office..... | 2,500.00 | 1,000.00 |
| Bureau of Efficiency..... | 850.00 | 145.00 |
| Civil Service Commission..... | 22,000.00 | 4,500.00 |
| Commission of Fine Arts..... | 120.00 | |
| Tariff Commission..... | | |
| State Department..... | 17,424.67 | |
| Treasury Department..... | 1,648,437.66 | 606,324.34 |
| District of Columbia..... | 306,867.42 | 76,387.30 |
| Advisory Committee for Aeronautics..... | 500.00 | |
| Arlington Memorial Amphitheater Commission..... | 80.00 | |
| Smithsonian Institution..... | 18,980.41 | 3,000.00 |
| Interstate Commerce Commission..... | 99,597.87 | 17,000.00 |
| Board of Mediation and Conciliation..... | 120.00 | |
| Federal Trade Commission..... | 24,250.00 | 3,000.00 |
| United States Employees Compensation Commission..... | 4,000.00 | |
| Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission..... | 200.00 | |
| United States Shipping Board..... | | |
| War Department—civil miscellaneous..... | 1,264,778.10 | 365,711.51 |
| Navy Department..... | 69,529.26 | 2,500.00 |
| Interior Department..... | 482,435.48 | 85,103.63 |
| Indian Service..... | 264,509.89 | 66,304.13 |
| Post Office Department..... | 61,000.00 | 10,000.00 |
| Department of Agriculture..... | 496,161.34 | 65,780.28 |
| Department of Commerce..... | 265,631.92 | 59,764.99 |
| Department of Labor..... | 89,800.00 | 30,000.00 |
| Department of Justice..... | 141,955.27 | 19,187.20 |
| Total..... | 5,613,349.29 | 1,470,658.38 |

Total for six months..... \$7,084,007.67
 Estimate for Navy for six months just received..... 200,000.00

7,284,007.67

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we are about to add approximately \$31,000,000 to the compensation of the employees included within the section. I have too often attempted to obtain some consideration of the fact that the compensation which this increase represents only serves to increase the expenses of the employees receiving it to take up the time of the Senate in making the effort again. Of course, as long as the increase has received the approval of the committee it will in all probability pass by the usual majority.

But I want to offer an amendment after the word "countries," in line 17, page 155, by striking out the period and inserting a semicolon, and adding the following words:

Employees working less than eight hours per day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Under the agreement that the committee amendments should have consideration before other amendments that amendment is not in order.

Mr. THOMAS. I thought the vote was taken on the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments have not been entirely disposed of, and the amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be considered just a little later.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is just one committee amendment yet.

Mr. THOMAS. I assumed that the amendment to which the Senator from Kansas offered his amendment had been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. Then, of course, I will wait.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire at the proper time to offer an amendment in lieu of the committee amendment on page 154. Will that be in order now?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If it is an amendment in lieu of the committee amendment it is in order now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I offer the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. At the foot of page 154, in lieu of the committee amendment, insert:

And in which the salaries have been fixed upon a basis, inclusive of temporary salary increases granted by law, since that date, such employees to receive increased compensation under this act at one-half the rate allowed by this section.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the object of the amendment is to put all the bureaus and divisions that have been created since January 1, 1916, on the same basis the committee places the War Risk Insurance Bureau. The representatives of the Federal employees had the following to say about it:

Furthermore, the specific mention of the War Risk Bureau in the Appropriations Committee's report creates certain inequalities with respect to other war bureaus or divisions in older departments created by law since January 1, 1916, where the salaries have not been fixed upon the basis calculated for the War Risk Bureau—in fact, have been fixed on a prewar basis. In order to adjust this inconsistency and at the same time, we believe, to carry out the intent of the Appropriations Committee, we suggest the amendment above mentioned.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not think that will do. We carefully investigated the proposals that came before the committee. Several other bureaus have been created since, and we investigated them like we did this bureau. We found they were getting the increased salary already, and that they were being paid under lump-sum appropriations. If you adopt this amendment, I will not say that every clerk in the Government, because I can not see that far, but if you adopt this amendment you are going to lift a lot of clerks who have already been getting higher salaries than the statutory clerks and pay above the basis. The Senate can not afford to do that. It is a question if you are going to equalize salaries to have a committee that will work it out. I will say to the Senator in reference to every one of these proposals of these other bureaus we gave them careful investigation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will not what the Senator says happen in the War Risk Insurance Bureau under the amendment you have presented?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; we investigated the War Risk Insurance Bureau, we had the Bureau of Efficiency investigate it, and on that report made this increase in the language we did, to equalize it with the statutory bureaus. You are playing in millions on this question. I think it would be most unwise to bet the game blind, and that is what it amounts to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas offered as a substitute.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator from Alabama permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask him in what respect the employees of the War Risk Bureau differ from the employees of these other bureaus?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator that we have an old statutory roll here that fixed the salaries before the

war of most clerks, not absolutely equal, but in the main they were carried in the same class of salary. There were certain lump-sum appropriations that were from time to time given to these bureaus and departments, and the salaries under the lump-sum appropriations were fixed at that basis. But then the war came along and a large number of new bureaus, some of them temporary bureaus for the war purposes, and some that are proving to be permanent bureaus, were established, with no limitation on the pay roll, but just a lump sum thrown out and the head of the bureau was told to employ people. On our investigation we found that the basis of salary which was fixed at that time was way above the statutory salary and the statutory pay as the basis for other clerks. Our effort here has been merely to equalize that. More than that, the clerks in the War Risk Bureau came here under a war basis and under a war salary. They got an increase that was so satisfactory that it has attracted them from other positions to come here and get this increased salary. That is not true of the old bureaus.

Mr. LENROOT. No; my inquiry was not as to the old bureaus, but as to the difference between the employees in the War Risk Bureau and the employees in other bureaus created since January 1, 1916.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will explain that the War Risk Bureau was established originally on the basis of a statutory bureau. Then there was the increase given to them to equalize or more than equalize the increased bonus we gave to statutory bureaus last year; but these other bureaus, as far as we investigated them, not only had more than that increase, but vastly more in salary. I am not speaking about individuals, but I am speaking about averages. We could not go into individuals. The salaries were vastly more and are more now than that of the clerks in statutory bureaus with the bonus added.

Mr. LENROOT. That may be true of the higher positions, but is that true of the ordinary grade clerk?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is more true of the low position than it is of the high position.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, from such investigation as I have been able to make, which accorded with the investigation made by the committee so far as the Bureau of War Risk Insurance is concerned, I have not been able to find any distinction between the employees of the War Risk Bureau and the employees of these other bureaus. It does seem to me that they all ought to be put upon an equality.

When the Senator says that the employees of these other bureaus are now receiving the benefit of the \$120 increase, that is true; but so are the employees of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance now receiving the benefit of the \$120 increase. If we are to give a further increase of \$120, as this bill does, to the regular employees that it gives to employees of the War Risk Bureau, I can not for the life of me see why the employees in these other bureaus should not be entitled to the same increase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered as a substitute by the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] to the amendment of the committee on page 154 of the bill.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. Has the amendment been adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not yet been adopted. Has the Senator from New York an amendment to this amendment?

Mr. CALDER. I have not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the committee on page 154 of the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment to which I called attention a few moments ago. On page 155, line 17, in the House text, after the word "country," I move to strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the words "employees working less than eight hours per day."

Mr. President, just a word in regard to this amendment. A very substantial increase will be made to this bill for the compensation of employees, and the Senator having the bill in charge has told the Senate that an attempt has been made to equalize the compensation as far as the committee could do so. In connection with this increase, which in the aggregate is enormous, and in connection with the attempt to equalize the compensation, there should also be an effort to equalize the hours of employment.

It is the purpose of this amendment to place within the excepted classes those employees who do not at present serve the Government the usual number of hours generally prevailing—that is to say, eight hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. On a division the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CALDER. I submit the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 10, line 5, after the semicolon and before the word "in" insert—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York is an amendment to the committee amendment which has already been agreed to. He will have to ask for a reconsideration. Without objection, a reconsideration is ordered, and now the Secretary will report the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 10, line 5, in the committee amendment before the word "in" insert:

Ninety-four additional clerks at \$1,200 each, one for each Senator having no more than one clerk and two assistant clerks for himself or for the committee of which he is the chairman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I merely wished to discuss the amendment.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, this amendment puts into the regular appropriation a provision for a continuance during the next fiscal year of the additional clerks authorized during the present session, which were paid out of the contingent fund.

I know everyone will agree that this additional clerk is needed. For my part not only do I need this clerk, but I pay out of my own pocket for two additional clerks, and I know many Senators pay out of their own pockets to take care of assistants in their offices.

I believe the Senate ought to supply sufficient clerical aid for Senators. If I could have my way about it, I would establish a fund here that would give every Senator all the assistants needed in his office. In my office we need at least eight. We have six, four paid for by the Government and two paid for by myself.

I hope this amendment will prevail. I think Senators generally understand what it means, and I do not believe it requires any further explanation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, the effect of the amendment will be to make a charge on the Treasury of something over \$115,000 a year for additional clerk hire for the Members of the Senate. I have not any doubt that there are certain Senators here who either because of the size of their States or the tremendous pressure of business on them at times for some reasons require more than the three clerks who are now provided by law for Senators, but a large number of Senators do not require an additional clerk. I have a reasonable amount of business to do, and I attend to my business with three clerks. I had the opportunity of appointing an additional clerk this year, but I have not found it necessary to do so. I know that is true of a good many other Senators.

I would be perfectly willing to take care of this situation in the future, for Senators who really needed it, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, but to create a statutory provision where an additional clerk, at \$1,200, will be given to each Senator, when probably half of them do not require the service, at a cost of \$115,000 to the Government of the United States I do not believe we are justified in doing, and I think the amendment ought to be defeated.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I can only speak in this matter out of the abundance of experience I have in my own office, and I want to say that no three clerks ought to be required to do the work in my office. If other Senators are situated as I am, they need four clerks, and those four clerks will be about as busy as any young people ought to be required to be. If this amendment is not adopted something ought to be done to relieve Senators from the larger States.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. I do not believe that any Senator is going to have in his office at Government expense more clerks than are required. I do know that I will require more than the Government furnishes me.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have just said that out of the contingent fund of the Senate at the next session I think any Senators who need more clerical force to attend to their business should have it, and it can be provided in that way. But if you adopt this amendment you make it a permanent part of the

organization of the Senate that each Senator shall have four clerks, whether he needs them or not.

Mr. POMERENE. Then, may I suggest this amendment to the one offered by the Senator from New York:

Provided, That the Senator seeking to employ this additional clerk will certify to the necessity of that employment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think that covers the case. I think it ought to be taken up as it has in the past and paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate. I hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the amendment.

On a division the amendment to the amendment was agreed to. Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment on page 3.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand that the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the committee amendment was agreed to. Has the amendment as amended been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not. The Senator from Delaware is entirely correct about that. If the Senator from Massachusetts will withhold his amendment for a moment, the Chair will put the question. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 10, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I desire to offer an amendment on page 3, line 6, to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$3,500"; and in the same line to strike out the words "assistants—two at \$2,250 each" and to insert "first assistant, John W. Lambert, \$2,500"; and then to insert "one assistant at \$2,250."

Mr. President, I desire to say a word in explanation of the amendment. The document room is of great importance to the business and comfort of the Senate. Mr. Boyd, the head of the office, has been in the service of the Senate for 48 years. He has been for many years in his present place, named by the bill. His salary has not been advanced since 1888. As it is given to him by name, it is not permanent, but it only goes to him while he is the incumbent of the office.

The other amendments which I offer on behalf of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] cover the case of Mr. Lambert, who is now the principal assistant in the document room. He is a singularly valuable man, and I should be very glad to see him also named in the bill, as is Mr. Boyd, with this slight increase of \$250 in his salary, because of the importance of the document room to the service of the Senate. I think both men ought to have these trifling increases.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not like to raise a question against the faithful, deserving employees of the Senate. We have here an exceptionally fine set of men. There is, however, a limit to which we can go. There have been a number of increases already put on this bill for Senate employees and for clerks. Of course, it is for the Senate to determine as to how far it wants to go; but if we continue to put these increases into the bill whenever they are proposed I do not see how the Senate expects its conferees to accomplish what they desire. There is a limit to carrying this load; a limit that we can get the House to agree to. We are within a few days of the end of the session, and there are a great many things in the bill that we want. I think we have about reached the time when we should draw the line. I have nothing to say against the particular amendment which the Senator from Massachusetts offers. I have no doubt these men are deserving.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in favor of the entire amendment. Mr. Boyd has been in his present position for many years, and since 1888 there has been no increase in his salary. He has been a most efficient officer.

Mr. Lambert has been in his position for six years and he is also a most efficient officer. The salary he is now getting is \$2,250. Everybody recognizes that it is almost impossible for him to live on it. This is an increase of only \$250. He is the first assistant in the document room. Of course, the work of the position has grown largely and he is rendering very valuable service. I think every Senator will readily agree with me that not only is he an efficient and a courteous man, thoroughly familiar with the office, but that he is one who renders more service perhaps than any other man, except the principal, who has been there for many years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge]. [Putting the question.] The ayes appear to have it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask for a division on the amendment. The question being put, on a division the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KIRBY, Mr. HENDERSON, and others addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas, Mr. LODGE. I think I have the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. KIRBY. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. LODGE. I thought I had the floor; but I presume I lost it when the Senate took a division.

Mr. KIRBY. I will yield to the Senator, if he so desires.

Mr. LODGE. I have another amendment to offer.

Mr. KIRBY. I have an amendment to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Massachusetts next.

Mr. LODGE. Very well.

Mr. KIRBY. I desire to offer an amendment, on page 30, line 2, to strike out the amount of the salary of the superintendent of the Botanic Garden, "\$2,250," and to insert "\$3,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Under the head of Botanic Garden, on page 30, line 2, after the word "superintendent," it is proposed to strike out "\$2,250" and to insert "\$3,000," so as to read:

For superintendent, \$3,000.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, this amendment is to increase the salary of the superintendent of the Botanic Garden, a man who is altogether capable and efficient, and who has been getting a very small salary under existing conditions as compared with the salaries of the chiefs of other bureaus and divisions of this same department of the service. I think the man, because of what he is compelled to know in order to hold that sort of a position, to be efficient, and to be of advantage to the Government, is entitled to something like a reasonable salary. For that reason I have offered the amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to offer the following amendment: On page 62, line 12, after the colon, I move to insert:

Provided, That of this amount \$184,160 shall be available, to be expended by the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with the estimate submitted by him to the Secretary of the Treasury January 25, 1919.

That is to provide for the extension which will be necessary under the child-labor law. I hold the estimate in my hand, and it gives the purposes of the distribution. It is a regular estimate.

To enable the Secretary of Labor to make inspections and to fulfill such other duties as may be assigned to him for the purpose of carrying into effect, in cooperation with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the provisions of the bill H. R. 12863, sections 1200-1207, to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which relate to the tax on employment of child labor in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including traveling expenses.

And so forth.

I do not know whether it is necessary to add that clause, as the amendment refers to it. It adds nothing, as I have said, to the appropriation, but it makes provision for the proper enforcement of the law, the Secretary of Labor now having these inspectors.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit an inquiry, does it subtract that amount from the appropriations given to some other department or agency of the Government?

Mr. LODGE. No; it is taken from the general appropriation which covers all these matters.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator that there was a child-labor law on the statute books, but the Supreme Court decided that it was unconstitutional. A provision of this kind was formerly carried in the bill to enforce the provisions of that child-labor law, but when this recommendation was made to the committee there was no child-labor law on the statute books, and therefore the committee did not insert the appropriation. Since that time the revenue bill has been passed carrying a child-labor provision, which, although not the law, will be the law when the President returns to the United States and signs it. I am not sure about the amount, but I am willing to concede that some amount is needed under the proposed new law.

Mr. LODGE. The item has been very carefully estimated.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HARDWICK. I wish to state to the Senator from Massachusetts that no child-labor law is yet on the statute books. There is a child-labor tax that will have to be collected, but even that has not become a law—

Mr. LODGE. My amendment refers to no statute.

Mr. HARDWICK. And there is no justification whatever for the Senator's amendment.

Mr. LODGE. We are going to have such a law.

Mr. HARDWICK. No; a tax.

Mr. LODGE. It has passed both Houses.

Mr. HARDWICK. But it is in the form of a tax.

Mr. LODGE. We have already made provisions in this bill for items under the revenue bill; they have been made this afternoon.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, what I wish to say to the Senator is that the provision on this subject in the revenue bill is very different from the former law. The provision in the revenue bill provides for a tax, while the previous law provided for an inspection of personal service. I am perfectly willing, of course, to agree to an amendment that is proposed to enforce an existing law—and I regard the provision in its present shape as being practically an existing law, because it will be such within a few days; but I am not informed as to the amount that may be needed. I am willing for the amendment to go—

Mr. HARDWICK. I hope the Senator will not accept the amendment. I am going to make a point of order against it.

Mr. LODGE. It is not subject to a point of order; it is regularly estimated for.

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, no. It is not authorized by existing law. I am not making that suggestion in any technical spirit, but we have not a child-labor law on the statute books; we have a tax which the Treasury Department will have to collect.

Mr. LODGE. The amendment I offer is to collect that tax.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not think so. There is no authority of law for it, Mr. President, and I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. It is in conformity with the estimate of the department.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if it would not be the duty of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the officials who come under him to proceed to collect the tax provided in the act to which the Senator refers and if in the collection of that tax they find infractions of the law it would be their duty doubtless to take such steps as would be proper?

Mr. LODGE. It is utterly impossible to collect this tax unless the officers know the articles in connection with the manufacture of which child labor is employed. The tax falls on articles in which child labor is used, and therefore they must have that information in order to impose the tax.

Mr. KING. What I have in mind is the fact that the duties resting upon the internal-revenue officers are manifold; they have to make inspection of the business of corporations to find out whether or not they have profits, and the bill carries a large appropriation to enable them to perform their functions.

Mr. LODGE. This is to give them the benefit of the work of the Children's Bureau, which now exists and is used to enforce the law which already is found on the statute books and which gathers statistics in regard to child labor. The bureau is there; it is provided for by statute, and has appropriations made for gathering statistics. They see to the enforcement of the law in the District of Columbia. This amendment is to extend the work of that bureau and to enable the Internal Revenue Bureau to have the benefit of the information collected by the Children's Bureau, so that it may collect the taxes.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there would necessarily be a duplication. The Internal Revenue Commissioner has certain duties to perform, among them that of collecting taxes and in ascertaining the taxes to be collected—

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will permit me, it is not a duplication, because the service does not exist in the Internal Revenue Bureau. They have no means of collecting the information. It is to prevent duplication; it is to prevent the establishment of another body of inspectors in the Internal Revenue Bureau to do what the Labor Department is doing now.

Mr. KING. As I conceive the situation, it is this: Those persons who are engaged in interstate commerce and employ children under a certain age shall be subject to a tax, and it will be the duty of the Internal Revenue Commissioner to collect that tax upon the persons engaged in such business.

Mr. LODGE. And you must give him additional inspectors.

Mr. KING. Well, the Internal Revenue Commissioner has assigned to him a very large sum—ten or eleven million dollars—with which to enforce the law.

Mr. LODGE. That is what this is taken from.

Mr. KING. He has the machinery with which to carry out the law.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will excuse me, I am a member of the Finance Committee, and I say to the Senator the commissioner has not the machinery. Here is the machinery made to his hand. What the Senator is desiring is to duplicate what already exists.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not want any duplication; I want to prevent duplication.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is going directly at a duplication.

Mr. KING. The Internal Revenue Commissioner is charged with the responsibility of collecting the tax, and, therefore, he should see to it that the law with respect to it is enforced.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I should like to be heard briefly on the point of order I have made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, the point of order ought first to be settled before the merits of the question are argued. Rule XVI provides:

And no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill or to add a new item of appropriation unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law or treaty stipulation or act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session, or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate or proposed in pursuance of an estimate of the head of some one of the departments.

There is no law that authorizes this proposed appropriation.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I will ask the Secretary to give me the amendment. I have a right to modify my amendment.

Mr. HARDWICK. Of course; I am not making any technical point as to that. If the Senator wants to change his amendment, I should like to have him do so, so that I may know what the amendment is.

Mr. LODGE. I have a right to modify the amendment.

Mr. HARDWICK. Not in my time.

Mr. LODGE. Well, the Senator can go on. I will modify the amendment, so that it will not be subject to the point of order, but I do not wish to take the Senator's time if he desires to discuss his point of order.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will be glad to yield to the Senator to allow him to make the change now. I do not wish to be technical about it, but I do not think the Senator has a leg to stand on.

Mr. LODGE. I desire to change the amendment so that it will read:

In accordance with the estimate submitted by him to the Secretary of the Treasury January 25, 1919, for the enforcement of any law relating to child labor hereafter enacted.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, there is no law now relating to child labor, and none is proposed.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will pardon me, there is a law relative to child labor, and there is an entire bureau to deal with it.

Mr. HARDWICK. That bureau has fallen to the ground by reason of the fact that the highest court in the land has decided that the law on which it was based is unconstitutional.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator surely can not be right. They have not decided that it is unconstitutional to gather statistics about child labor.

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, no.

Mr. LODGE. Or that the law was unconstitutional as applied to the District of Columbia; and that bureau exists for that purpose.

Mr. HARDWICK. But the part of the machinery that the Senator wants to employ, and which he has in mind now, has no legal right to existence in this country. There is no existing law that either authorizes or proposes to cover the Senator's proposal. We have a pending revenue bill which has not become a law. I do not know what its legal status is; it is like Mahomet's coffin; it is not signed and it is not presented; I do not know where it is or what the status of it is; but I think there is a pending proposal that we shall levy a tax on certain kinds of products. That would be no justification whatever for this, nor do I understand it. There was a good deal of confusion here. I did not catch very clearly what the Senator said nor hear very plainly what the Secretary read; but, as I understand, the Senator has no estimate.

Mr. LODGE. I have an estimate—an official estimate.

Mr. HARDWICK. From whom?

Mr. LODGE. From the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. HARDWICK. From the Secretary of Labor, under the old law?

Mr. LODGE. Not under any old law at all. It refers to the new law hereafter to be enacted.

Mr. HARDWICK. The revenue law?

Mr. LODGE. The revenue law.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Secretary of Labor has asked it for the revenue law?

Mr. LODGE. He has a right to make an estimate for that purpose.

Mr. HARDWICK. He has no right, under the statutes of the United States, to make an estimate for the revenue law.

Mr. LODGE. It comes through the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does the Secretary of the Treasury submit that regularly to Congress? Will the Senator let me see it? I have not had an opportunity to see it.

Mr. LODGE. It was sent to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Secretary of Labor on January 25.

Mr. HARDWICK. Sent to the Secretary of the Treasury? Well, it has not come here.

Mr. LODGE. That was too late for the revenue bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. Then, it is not here. If he has just sent a recommendation to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Senator would not claim that that was an estimate. Let us see what it is. It is just a memorandum, sent here by the Secretary of Labor, suggesting to the Secretary of the Treasury that he ought to do this thing, and the Senator calls that an estimate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair ask the Senator from Georgia a question?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not seen the opinion of the Supreme Court. In declaring the child-labor law invalid did the Supreme Court declare the whole act invalid, or did it confine its opinion to declaring invalid that provision which imposed a restriction on interstate commerce?

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, the whole act, if the Chair pleases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The act, as the Chair recalls it, provided for an elaborate system—either that act or the act to which this amendment refers.

Mr. HARDWICK. There is another law which provided for quite a system of inspectors, and so on; and the Chair evidently has that in mind. That has no relation whatever to the question pending before the Senate. The question pending before the Senate is this: The Senator from Massachusetts now moves to insert in this bill an amendment providing funds for enforcing the provision in the pending revenue bill that has not become the law; and he submits in support of that proposal, what? A memorandum from the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. LODGE. It is not a memorandum; it is an estimate from the head of that department. I suggest that the Senator from Georgia read the rule.

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, the Senator from Georgia has read the rule, and is quite familiar with it.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad he has, because it is in pursuance of an estimate of the head of some one of the departments.

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, I think the Senator from Massachusetts is begging the question.

Mr. LODGE. I am not begging the question.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am giving the Senator my opinion of his position.

Mr. LODGE. This is an estimate submitted by the head of one of the departments.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; but it is not an estimate submitted by the head of the department having the matter in charge, and the Senator knows it full well.

Mr. LODGE. It does not make any difference, under the rule, whether it is submitted by the head of that department or not, so long as it is submitted by the head of some one of the departments.

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, no! If the Senator is right, then if the Secretary of Labor sent us an estimate recommending the construction of three battleships, that would be authority for such an amendment on this floor. [Laughter.]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator whether he thinks this whole provision of \$21,000,000, the whole paragraph which this amendment seeks to amend, is in order or out of order?

Mr. HARDWICK. Why, that question is not pending. I should say that I should think it is in order.

Mr. LENROOT. If the Senator thinks it is in order, I want to call his attention to the fact that this \$21,000,000 appropriation is for the purpose of enforcing the revenue act of 1918, which has not yet been signed by the President, and in which is included this very provision.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; but I will call the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to the Senate rule which makes that in order when it is reported by a standing committee of the Senate. Now the Senator from Massachusetts proposes this amendment from the floor, which is a very different proposition in the Senate of the United States. Now, let us see:

All annual estimates for the public service shall be submitted to Congress through the Secretary of the Treasury, and shall be included in the Book of Estimates prepared under his direction.

There is no estimate here that the Senator from Massachusetts can rely on unless he has an estimate submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress, and not a memorandum or something that he calls an estimate from the Secretary of Labor addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury. There is no law, there is no estimate, and the point of order is absolutely good, in my opinion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hear from the Senator from Massachusetts on the point of order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I can only say that this is a general appropriation, made to carry out, among other things, the provisions—the appropriation is framed on that basis—of the revenue act which has not yet been signed by the President. I modified my amendment so as to make it "hereafter enacted," which, I think, avoids that point.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. One word further. This is an estimate regularly sent in by the Secretary of Labor to the Treasury Department. It is in pursuance of an estimate of the head of some one of the departments, which meets the provision of our rule. It does not seem to me to be out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair overrules the point of order; and the Senator from Georgia may appeal, if he desires.

Mr. HARDWICK. Why, Mr. President, just simply in the interest of something like an intelligent exposition of the rules, I think, I must take an appeal, although I do not want to take up the time of the Senate at this late hour. I believe I will address the Senate on it briefly, too. I hate very much to do it at this time of the evening. I suppose, though, we have plenty of time.

Every Member of the Senate, I suppose, is familiar with Rule XVI, which provides that when a Member from the floor proposes an amendment to a general appropriation bill he must have either authority of law or an estimate. Now, there is no authority of law for this appropriation, it is admitted. They have what the Chair rules to be an estimate, in that the Secretary of Labor sent to the Secretary of the Treasury a memorandum saying that something like this ought to be done. I call attention not only to the rule but to the thing to which I directed the attention of the Chair, the Revised Statutes of the United States, which provide that—

All annual estimates for the public service shall be submitted to Congress through the Secretary of the Treasury, and shall be included in the Book of Estimates prepared under his direction—

That is from section 3669 of the Revised Statutes—

and hereafter all estimates of appropriations and estimates of deficiencies in appropriations intended for consideration, and seeking the action of any committee of the Congress, shall be transmitted to Congress through the Secretary of the Treasury, and in no other manner.

Now, the Senator from Massachusetts, with the august sanction of the Chair, has announced the proposition to the Senate of the United States that if one Secretary sends to another a memorandum saying that an estimate ought to be sent to Congress for a thing like that, that amounts to an estimate under the standing rules of the Senate.

I am ready to vote on the matter.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, in so far as this amendment is claimed to be out of order under the rule referred to by the Senator, I submit that the rule makes it expressly in order, as he will see in a moment.

No amendment shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law or treaty stipulation—

Now, that is not the case here—

or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session.

And this act has already passed the Senate at this session. Now, the other alternative:

Or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate—

That has nothing whatever to do with the question. This child-labor taxation law passed the Senate at this session; and the amendment, therefore, is in order.

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator, I think, is in utter error, if he will excuse me for putting it that strongly. I have a very high regard for him, and I know that he would not make an intentional error; but he is in error in his expression when he says that this is something that has passed the Senate during the present session. That means a measure that has passed the Senate in the form of an appropriation—a bill or resolution making an appropriation.

Mr. LENROOT. No; the language is:

Unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law or treaty stipulation or act or resolution previously passed by the State during that session.

Now, what has been done with reference to the child-labor taxation law? It has imposed a tax. It has directed the Secretary of the Treasury to enforce that law. It has further provided in that act that upon application of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue or the Secretary of the Treasury he may call upon the Secretary of Labor to assist him in the enforcement of this law, and that is all that this amendment seeks to do. But, further than that, Mr. President, this amendment makes no appropriation. It increases no appropriation. It merely provides for making available a certain portion of an appropriation that is made in this bill. From every standpoint it is clearly in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia appeal from the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

Upon a division, the ruling of the Chair was sustained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether out of abundant caution he will not consent to further modifying the amendment by inserting the word "taxation" after the words "child-labor," so as to make it read "child-labor taxation"?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly. I will ask to have the amendment stated as modified.

The SECRETARY. As modified, the amendment reads:

Provided, That of this amount \$184,160 shall be available to be expended by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the estimate submitted by him to the Secretary of the Treasury January 25, 1919, for the enforcement of any law relating to child labor hereafter enacted.

Mr. LENROOT. The word "taxation" should be inserted there.

Mr. LODGE. "Any law relating to the taxation of child labor."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator accept that amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No, Mr. President; we want to know what it is. We want to see whether we object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I withdrew the last modification and will leave it as it stood before.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment as it now stands.

The SECRETARY. On page 62, line 12, after the numerals and after the colon, it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That of this amount \$184,160 shall be available to be expended by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the estimate submitted by him to the Secretary of the Treasury January 25, 1919, for the enforcement of any law relating to child labor hereafter enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, just for the purpose of keeping the permanent RECORD of the Senate straight, to the present proposal of the Senator from Massachusetts I do make a point of order, which I should like to have the RECORD show.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is overruled. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to have the estimate printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CHILDREN'S BUREAU.

To enable the Secretary of Labor to make inspections and to fulfill such other duties as may be assigned to him for the purpose of carrying into effect, in cooperation with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the provisions of the bill (H. R. 12863, section 1200-1207) "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes," which relates to the tax on employment of child labor in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including traveling expenses, per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, rental of offices outside the District of Columbia, telegraph and telephone service, express and freight charges, purchase of law books, books of reference, and periodicals, contingent and miscellaneous expenses, printing and binding, and personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere (submitted), \$184,160.

Employees.

| | Rate. | Estimated, 1920. |
|--|---------|---------------------|
| Salaries (in District of Columbia): | | |
| Director..... | \$4,500 | 1 |
| Assistant director..... | 3,000 | 1 |
| Law officer..... | 3,000 | 1 |
| Inspector in charge of State corporation..... | 2,620 | 1 |
| Administrative clerk..... | 2,120 | 1 |
| Supervisor of issuing certificates of age..... | 2,120 | 1 |
| Clerks..... | 1,720 | 2 |
| Do..... | 1,520 | 4 |
| Do..... | 1,320 | 4 |
| Messenger..... | 840 | 1 |
| Salaries (outside of District of Columbia): | | |
| Supervising inspectors..... | 2,120 | 6 |
| Inspectors..... | 1,920 | 6 |
| Assistant inspectors..... | 1,520 | 19 |
| Issuing officers..... | 1,320 | 15 |
| Clerks..... | 1,520 | 7 |
| Total..... | | 70 |

¹ Average.

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Salaries..... | \$116,560 |
| Other objects of expenditure: | |
| Traveling expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence..... | 50,600 |
| Office rentals outside of District of Columbia, including equipment and care of same..... | 6,000 |
| Telephone and telegraph, freight and express, books, contingent, and miscellaneous..... | 3,000 |
| Printing and binding..... | 2,000 |
| Total..... | 184,160 |

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 11, line 5, in the item relative to the press gallery of the Senate, in the salary of the superintendent, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,800" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$2,500."

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I think that in attainment, faithful service, character, and inadequacy of compensation, the superintendent of the press gallery is entitled to as many superlatives as any officer of the Senate who has been benefited by our action here this afternoon, and then some. Moreover, Mr. President, inasmuch as the popular view of our statesman-like qualities is largely made up by the work of the press gallery, there may be a sentimental reason for our taking action here, which seems to be the only manner by which we can express our appreciation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES].

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON. I offer the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. In line 16, page 10, strike out "\$2,000" at the end of the line, and insert in lieu "\$2,500," so as to read:

Acting Assistant Doorkeeper, \$3,000, two floor assistants at \$2,500 each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HENDERSON. On page 68, line 10, I move to amend by striking out "\$1,800" and inserting "\$2,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 68, line 10, relative to the Carson, (Nev.) mint, the bill reads:

Assayer in charge, who shall also perform the duties of melter, \$1,800.

It is now proposed to strike out "\$1,800" and in lieu to insert "\$2,000."

Mr. SMOOT. I know the Senate is running away on these matters. I suppose Senators do not care what they put in the bill, but I want to say to the Senator from Nevada that if we begin to raise salaries in the mints we are going to lose the whole mints. We have had a mighty hard time to keep them in the bill in the past.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have been informed that the salary was \$2,000 some years ago, and it is hard now under present conditions to live on \$1,800. I simply propose to make it \$2,000.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows that no one made a harder fight for the retention of the mints and assay offices than I did. In fact, we remained here one night all night long, at the close of a short session of Congress, in order to keep them in the bill. But the impression is and the feeling is in the House of Representatives that they should go out. I hope the Senator will not insist at this time on raising the salaries for these assay offices. I appeal to him because I know what is back of it, and I do not think it will do any good. It will go out in conference, and it will only tend to arouse a feeling that I do know exists.

Mr. HENDERSON. I feel, Mr. President, that this is the smallest amount that is asked as a raise, \$200; and it is just as necessary as any other raise or any amount that is in the bill. One thousand eight hundred dollars is the salary of the assayer at the Carson Mint, and he can not live on it. He probably can not more than get through with \$2,000. I think the amendment is just and fair. I do not see why the Members of the House should object to this slight raise.

Mr. SMOOT. All I say is I am not going to ask that the same thing be done for the assay offices in Utah, because I know what the result ultimately will be, and as a friend of the assay offices of the country I am not going to ask for an increase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON]. On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to offer an amendment at page 106 of the bill. The purpose of the amendment is to change the item from \$3,500 to \$4,500, and to change the footing from \$50,000 to \$106,000. The object of it is to increase the limitation upon salaries in the Bureau of Education. It is very difficult now to get men of proper caliber and ability and training and education and skill to carry on this work at a salary of \$3,500. That is absolutely the outside salary. I therefore offer the amendment, and I ask the Secretary to read it.

The SECRETARY. On page 106 the paragraph reads:

For investigation of rural education, industrial education, physical education, and school hygiene, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and no salary shall be paid hereunder in excess of \$3,500 per annum, \$50,000.

It is now proposed to strike out in line 13 "\$3,500" and to insert in lieu "\$4,500" and to change the figure in line 14 from "\$50,000" to "\$106,000."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator from Florida I do not think it is possible to accomplish any result in conference with these amendments carrying increases. I thought at first that the proposal is in line with the current law, but I understand it is not.

Mr. FLETCHER. The original act of 1867, establishing this bureau, provides its duties, for the collection of statistics and facts showing the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories and to diffuse such information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems and methods of teaching as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of a national school system and otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country.

The object of the amendment is to raise the limitation upon the salaries and to increase the personnel of the three important lines of work covered by the item, so that it may be carried on strongly and effectively. A comparatively small part of the increase, after all, goes to the increase in salaries—not more than 25 per cent. The balance of it provides for an increase in personnel.

I am not going to take the time of the Senate to press the matter. It is very important work. We can not fail to look after the educational interests, hygiene, health, and welfare of the people as contemplated by the act. Calls from all over the country come for advice and assistance from teachers and schools, and the information can not be furnished unless you provide the money by which men can be employed to get it.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not the calls so much for assistance as it is for dollars and cents. They would not care very much about the assistance unless it carried with it dollars and cents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER].

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment submitted by the Senator from Maryland.

The SECRETARY. On page 153, line 8, strike out the figures "\$240" and insert in lieu thereof "\$360."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maryland will allow me, I desire to make a point of order against that amendment. I make the point of order that it increases the appropriation on this bill without being recommended by the committee, that it is not estimated for by the head of any department, and, third, that it is not moved by the direction of any standing or select committee of the Senate. It seems to me clearly that it is within Rule XVI. The Chair is familiar with the rule, as it has just been read. I therefore make the point of order, and I think that ought to be disposed of first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hear the Senator from Maryland on the point of order.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I do not feel that I care to discuss the point of order at this time. I realize that this amendment is subject to a point of order. I hoped that the chairman of the subcommittee would not make the point of order; but since he has made it, I am willing to submit to the judgment of the Chair. I do not care to detain the Senate at this time with any argument on the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained. Does the Senator from Maryland desire to insist upon the other two amendments which he sent to the desk?

Mr. FRANCE. They form really one amendment.

Mr. POMERENE. I send to the desk the following amendment, to be inserted on page 147, after line 20.

The SECRETARY. On page 147, after line 20, insert:

District court for the District of Panama: District judge, \$7,500 per annum, from March 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I will state the reason for this amendment. Senators will recall that the salaries of all the district judges were increased. This bill especially provides for the increase of the salaries of the two district judges in the Territory of Hawaii and also in the Territory of Porto Rico, but the one lone judge in Panama was overlooked. It is to correct what I think is an oversight that I offer this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE].

The question being put, a division was called for.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin desire to make some inquiry?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thought I would make some observations on this proposed amendment, but I can wait.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the right to make remarks. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it seems to me there ought not to be any question about raising the salary of this judge. I do not suppose any point of order can be made against the amendment, and I doubt, Mr. President, if it were subject to a point of order whether any point of order would be made against it, because it has been the practice of Congress to raise the salaries of Senators and Representatives and Cabinet officers and their assistants, and judges, but when any suggestion is made to the Congress of the United States that there should be an increase in the salaries of the employees of the Government who are earning less than enough to sustain life, every technicality that can be suggested and every argument that can be made is interposed to stop it.

There have been some investigations conducted by people entirely competent to make them as to the lowest possible amount upon which a family in this country can be subsisted. Such investigations were made in New York City in 1914. They have been conducted by this Government under an authorization by the United States Senate here in the District of Columbia. In 1914 a body of economists in New York City, after a thoroughgoing investigation, determined at that time that with the cost of living as it then stood, not less than \$880 could possibly carry a family of three children, a father, and mother through to the end of the year. Since that time the cost of living has advanced from 75 to 100 per cent.

I think that it was in 1916 that, under authority conferred by the Congress, an investigation as to the cost of living was

conducted by Government officials here in the city of Washington, and it was ascertained that the lowest possible sum upon which a family of five could be supported here in the District of Columbia in 1916 was \$1,080. Since that time the cost of living has steadily mounted.

Mr. President, I am aware of the fact that it is not at all popular to discuss this side of the proposition here in the Senate, but I never have been guided by considerations of that sort in my course. I am not at all surprised that so many Senators retire to the cloakroom when the attention of the country is to be called to the fact that since 1905 we have made the following increases in the salaries higher up.

The President's salary has been increased 50 per cent; the salary of the Private Secretary to the President has been increased 50 per cent; the salary of the Vice President has been increased 50 per cent; the salary of the secretary to the Vice President has been increased 81 per cent; salaries of United States Senators have been increased 50 per cent; salaries of Representatives in Congress have been increased 50 per cent; the salary of the Secretary of the Senate has been increased 30 per cent; of the Sergeant at Arms 44 per cent; the salary of the Speaker of the House of Representatives has been increased 50 per cent; of the secretary to the Speaker 33 per cent; of the Clerk of the House 30 per cent; of the Chief Clerk 25 per cent; of the Sergeant at Arms 44 per cent; of the Doorkeeper 42 per cent; the Secretary of State, 50 per cent; the Secretary of the Treasury, 50 per cent; the Secretary of War, 50 per cent; the Attorney General, 50 per cent; the Postmaster General, 50 per cent; the Secretary of the Navy 50 per cent; the Secretary of the Interior, 50 per cent; and the Secretary of Agriculture, 50 per cent.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Will the Senator state what period that covers?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. From 1905 to 1915.

Senators find occasion for agitated inquiry here as to the subject of unrest in this country. The salary of the Chief Justice was increased 15 per cent, and the Associate Justices 16 per cent. The salary of the Chief Justice was raised from \$13,500 to \$15,000 a year; the Associate Justices from \$12,000 to \$14,000; the circuit judges from \$7,000 to \$8,500; the district judges from \$6,000 to \$7,500.

Two years ago on this floor I made an appeal to the Senate one night calling attention to some of these increases in the salaries of the higher-ups, and succeeded in getting the approval of the Senate for an increase for the employees in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which was on a conference report, and the vote of the Senate at that time made that increase absolute as to those employees. In order to equalize the salaries of other employees, which was forced upon an unwilling Congress, an increase of \$120 a year, as it finally worked out, was obtained in the salaries of Government employees receiving less than over \$2,500 a year.

What did that increase of salary amount to in percentages? The increase for those receiving \$2,500 was 4 per cent and a fraction; for those receiving \$2,400, it was 5 per cent; for those receiving \$2,220, it was 5 per cent and a fraction; for those receiving \$2,000, it was 6 per cent; for those receiving \$1,800, it was 6.6 per cent; for those receiving \$1,600, it was 8 per cent; for those receiving \$1,440, it was 8.40 per cent; for those receiving \$1,400, it was 8.6 per cent; for those receiving \$1,300, it was 9.2 per cent; for those receiving \$1,200, it was 10 per cent; for those receiving \$1,100, it was 10.9 per cent; and for those receiving \$1,000, it was 12 per cent.

Now, mark you, when you get down to \$1,000 you are down to the line below the level of where you could support away back in 1916 a family of five persons on that salary. Just think of it, Senators! It makes some Senators smile.

The percentage of increase in the salaries of those receiving a salary of \$800 was 15; it was an increase in salaries of \$720—and you are below the life line now—of 16½ per cent; on salaries of \$600, it was an increase of 20 per cent; on salaries of \$540, it was an increase of 22 per cent; on salaries of \$500, it was an increase of 24 per cent; on salaries of \$480, it was an increase of 25 per cent; and on salaries of \$400, it was an increase of 30 per cent.

Just think of it, Mr. President! Employees of this Government receiving a salary of \$400 a year and trying to take care of a family, with the cost of maintaining a family in New York figured at the lowest possible limit, where charity doles out the amount—in New York, away back of the war period, it was \$880; in the city of Washington in 1916 it was \$1,080.

How did they make up the balance? They found jobs at night. When sickness falls upon the family, when trouble comes, when death throws its shadow across the threshold, collections are taken up among those who are not so unfortun-

nate, upon whom affliction has not yet been visited. That is the way they do it. If you want the testimony for it, it is to be found in the records of the committees of Congress. These Government employees have appeared before the committees of this Congress to plead their cause for higher wages under the conditions that exist to-day, and I have before me here ample evidence which they have furnished of the hard conditions under which they live; how they are compelled to take up collections whenever affliction comes upon a family.

Back of the time of high war prices, Senators will vote themselves an increase of salary of 50 per cent and deny to Government employees a percentage of increase that will sustain life, and yet they marvel and complain and threaten because there is dissatisfaction in this country; they organize investigations to find out why it is that meetings are held and voices are raised protesting against the condition of things that exists here to-day.

Mr. President, the Senate Chamber has been the scene of violent agitation and protest and declamation against complaints that have come from people representing the great protesting majority of this country as to conditions which exist here to-day. We have had the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD filled with maledictions against those who have raised their voices in complaint; but who has stood here in this presence assailing the Beef Trust, the United States Steel Corporation, the great organizations of greed and power that have been builded up in this country in the last 20 years, increasing, against all economic laws that should control prices, the cost of living steadily year by year? Scarcely a voice has been raised.

This serious condition of affairs is not the outgrowth, Mr. President, of the war. It has been on for a long period of time. The great masses of the people of this country are loyal to our system of government, sir. All they ask is justice and a fair chance. They are fairly intelligent; they know pretty well that something has been radically wrong with the economic system of this country. With the consent of the Government, for a score of years the cost of living had been slowly but steadily mounting upon the American people from 1898 down to August, 1914, when we began to feel the effects of the European war. Why was that so? I say to you, sir, that it should not have been so. The cost of living should have steadily decreased right along year by year instead of increasing year by year. Why do I say that? I say it because it is the law of civilization; I say it because the genius of the American people wrought out a system that should have resulted in a continual and steady decline in the cost of living. Throughout all these years the cost of production has steadily decreased, from the time this Government was established down to 1898. Why? Because there was the free play of all the economic forces in this country; because the most inventive country on the face of God's earth had been working out the problems of production and cutting down the cost of producing things by invention and by better organization; and the cost had steadily fallen down to that time.

Then we entered upon an era of the reorganization of business in this country. Up to that time the natural laws of trade and commerce had prevailed; competition had been free between all of the producing industries; but about that time one of the great business geniuses of this country devised a system of combination and control of market prices. It was wrought out in all its details; it took possession of every line of production. Behind the high tariff wall of the McKinley law that shut out foreign competition there was organized a combination between domestic producers; and, as a result of that combination, competition was suppressed, prices were controlled, and the American people began to pay more and more for everything they bought. Study Bradstreet's and Dun's reports and you will find a decline in the cost of production down to that time, and then you will find the cost of production beginning to mount year by year. There was no reason why that should be so, except for this unlawful, unjust, and uneconomic combination that controlled the market prices here among our own producers.

Why, Mr. President, if you will stop a moment to think about it, production cost, by invention, by better organization, by better methods of conducting sales, by better systems, from the raw material to the finished product, should furnish the finished product to the consumer year by year at a declining cost. Can there be any doubt about that? What else does civilization mean? What else does progress mean? The cost of living should have continued to fall year by year, just as it had through the years since the Republic was established, because inventions were more perfect, because methods were improved, because everything that related to the cost of production from the raw material until it reached the consumer as a finished product was being reduced. That is the law of our being; otherwise civilization is a lie.

It should have been easier in 1908 than in 1900 to support a family in this country; it should have been easier in 1910 than in 1908; it should have been easier in 1918 than in 1910, if the natural laws of trade had been given fair, free, and open play; but they were not; competition was suppressed; the amount produced was regulated and controlled and prices were fixed by combinations; and from that hour on the cost of living began to mount upon the people of this country. All the natural laws of trade and commerce, which for 5,000 years had prevailed in organized society, were reversed. Demand, supply, competition, should fix prices. Instead, we had the arbitrary will of a board of directors, operating with other boards of directors who were producing the same line of articles, fixing the prices, agreeing that there should be no competition, that so much of a product should be produced, that it should sell at so much, and able to enforce that upon the American people because of a high protective tariff shutting out foreign competition.

That is the answer and the solution of the increased cost of living from 1898 on. It mounted step by step, step by step. It has denied thousands, tens of thousands, and hundreds of thousands of children the education that their parents would have been able to give them except for that unlawful organization. It has violated every principle of right. It has undermined the principles of democracy. It has well-nigh destroyed, sir, a government of equality of rights. I say to you that instead of the cost of living mounting year by year the cost of living should have fallen year by year.

Oh, but I fancy that some Senator from some Eastern State is saying that "LA FOLLETTE ignores the fact that wages have been increased, and that that accounts for the increased cost to the consumer." Wages have not increased. It is a lie that wages have increased. I am speaking now of the period before the war. Wages fell. Counting the purchasing price of the dollar, wages fell steadily, year by year, under the power of this same controlling force. A competent and authoritative study of the trend of wages from 1900 down to 1914, 14 years, gives us the exact decline—an actual decline of 10 per cent in the wage of the laboring people of this country during that period of advancing prices and rise in the cost of living.

If you are looking for an answer to the question as to why there is unrest in this country, Mr. President, as to why people are striking, and as to why some of the more radical of them are saying extreme things, look for it in the United States Senate to-day. A dozen Senators here when the economic truths of the last 20 years are being recounted! If some Senator should rise here to denounce some meeting that is held where complaint is made, you would see the Senate thronged, and the seats filled; but when the real reason is stated that underlies the complaints that are in the hearts of the great body of the toilers of this country, only a few of whom have yet begun to express themselves, you see empty seats.

I say again, Mr. President, that every economic law that ought to rule society, that ought to regulate prices, that ought to determine wages, has been violated for the last score of years in the United States; and I say, look there if you are on the hunt for the motives that lie back of the surging that is sweeping across this country, that has not yet begun to break in waves, but that just shows in undulations upon the surface, but it represents a deep and a profound agitation below the surface.

Mr. President, the great mass of the American people have never been very far wrong. They have been pretty generally right; and it behooves those who nominally stand as their representatives to pay some heed to their voice when it is raised in protest. That protest has not been very violent. I pray God that it may be heeded in time.

Senators think they have been awfully generous to the Government employees because they have given them \$240, an increase of \$120 since a year ago. It was an increase of 10 per cent at that time, according to the figures of the Senator from Utah, who is always accurate. You did not flinch much when it came to giving yourselves 50 per cent. I did not see any points of order raised on it. I suppose probably it was not subject to a point of order, but it always lies with any Senator upon this floor to avail himself of a technicality or not, and I venture to suggest that perhaps it would be wise statesmanship not to invoke a technicality against a raise that is equitable and just. Think of an employee of this Government who is receiving \$600 or \$720, and trying to get along on it, and take care of a family or four or five children, and buy shoes at \$3, \$4, and \$5 a pair!

Mr. President, I expect the salaries of the judges in Porto Rico to be increased. Of course that will just level them up with the other judges whose salaries we have increased, and I expect that the great mass of employees who work for the Government, who on the average earn only \$918, or \$980 apiece—I do not

remember which—I expect that they will stand by you just the same. But mark you, Mr. President, the difference between the way in which they treat these employees and the way in which they treat themselves and the Cabinet officers and the judges. They give them, under the law, a permanent salary, fixed by statute. This is a bonus for the time being, and then you will drop back, you Government employees, to the old wage level of 1855. The wages of the employees of the Government have not been materially changed since 1855, but the salaries of Representatives, of Senators, of judges, of Cabinet officers, of Presidents, of ambassadors, have been raised enormously.

Mr. President, aside from all other questions, aside from the question of what is right and just between man and man, the course you are pursuing is not politic. I venture to say it is unwise statesmanship. When the amendment was proposed increasing the amount that should be paid to those employed in the War Risk Bureau the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] warned the Senators that "they were talking in millions now." Mr. President, justice, equity, what is right between employees, does not take account of amounts. When it came to increasing the salaries of United States Senators and Representatives and Cabinet ministers and ambassadors and Supreme Court Judges and Federal judges, all down the list, it would have been well enough then for the Senator from Alabama and for every other Senator on this floor to think about these increases, regardless of the question of whether the amounts were large or small, but on the basis of whether they were just in comparison with what other Government employees were receiving. Those increases were not necessary to provide bread and shelter and clothing for the family. They added to the luxuries that those high officials could bestow upon their families.

I am not complaining, sir, that these increases were made in those salaries. I recognize the existence of this artificial and unjust increase in the cost of living because of the unlawful combinations that have been permitted and that have been never protested by any administration, or only feebly protested, although there was ample power to have stopped them. But since they were permitted to have their way, since combinations and trusts could lay upon the backs of the American people whatever burdens they chose in violation of law, every burden so laid being a criminal act, I do not blame Congress for recognizing that fact and increasing their own salaries and those of the judges and the Cabinet ministers and the ambassadors and others who have received these magnificent additions to their salaries, but what I do protest is your beginning to economize when you come down to make a little, meager addition to the salaries of the mass of the Government employees, who have to figure, oh, so closely, to live. There is the rent, the grocer's bill, the meat bill, the doctor's bill; if there is anyone sick in the family, it is a calamity that calls for a family council in order to know how to meet it. When you come to consider those people who are living so close to the margin of existence, who are struggling for enough to get along with, then, I say, Mr. President, that that is the wrong time to begin to cut and to pare and to be technical.

Mr. President, I do not want to assume the rôle of prophecy. No man knows what the future veils; but I say that we shall be wise if we will try to be just to all the people in this country.

I am not going to protest against this increase in the salary of the judge or judges down in Porto Rico. I rather think they ought to be leveled up with the other fortunate fellows who have floated in on the high tide of congressional generosity, or fair dealing.

I am only sorry, Mr. President, that this proposed increase of \$1 a day to Government employees to meet the increased cost of living was not agreed to. It was figured out in 1914 by competent tribunals that made investigations, not only in New York City, but elsewhere over this country, fixing about \$880 as necessary for the support of a family of five. I regret beyond expression that the proposition here was not accepted to add to that amount a dollar a day to meet the increased cost that everybody agrees has come upon us, and there is plenty of evidence here, and I can read from the testimony of investigators who appeared before committees of Congress, that since 1916 the advance has been more than would be covered by this addition. If it were \$240 instead of \$120, it would not more than cover the added cost that has come by reason of the increase in the necessities of life.

Mr. President, I apprehend—

Mr. THOMAS. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. I want to say, first, that I was downstairs at the restaurant trying to get a little sustenance when I heard the Senator was addressing the Senate, and I came right up.

I sympathize entirely with the Senator's attitude regarding the duty which the Congress owes to the employees of the Gov-

ernment on account of the rise in prices. Since I have been in the Senate, I have, as far as I can now recall, voted against every increase in salaries, regardless of the officials the salaries would benefit. My contention has been, and I think it is correct, that those who supply the necessities of life—the landlord, the grocer, the dry-goods man, the shoe man—regulate their prices so as to absorb whatever amount of increase is made in the salaries of the employees, so that instead of benefiting the employees we really benefit the class which caters to their needs.

I have felt, and I think I have stated, on more than one occasion, that the Government can and ought to remedy this condition by fixing a maximum rate of rental and also of supplies, and seeing that through the proper agencies the employees of the Government shall be required to pay no more, covering the difference between the existing rates and the amount so fixed by the Government as a charge against the Treasury. I believe that would give a very substantial measure of relief. I am not a prophet, but I could almost prophesy that this raise which is given now will be followed by a demand for another, because of the consequent need due to the absorption of this increase by the very conditions that make it necessary.

I am prepared to join in an effort to frame some legislation, and to support it to the best of my ability, that will meet this situation and do justice. I am very much afraid it is the only way in which it can be done. I should like to have the opinion of the Senator upon that suggestion.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it may be that we will come to recognize the necessity of putting a limitation upon the charges of various kinds, but I have always been a pretty profound believer in the free play and operation of economic laws. I believe that if we had all the laws against combinations properly enforced competition would regulate prices for people who have to buy, whether it is rent or groceries or dry goods or the supplies of the butcher.

I do not believe that any of the administrations since the time that the Sherman antitrust law was enacted have ever attempted in any way to make an honest enforcement of that law. Attorneys General have been selected under influences that made it impossible. The enactment of the Sherman antitrust law, I believe, was the wisest piece of statesmanship that has been seen in a period of 75 years in this country.

I believe John Sherman, standing upon an eminence of statesmanship such as no other man of his time attained, foresaw exactly what was going to happen in this country, the result in part of artificial regulation of economic forces. He and those associated with him wrote upon the statute books that great law.

But, Mr. President, you need but look at the record to know that it never has been honestly enforced or attempted to be enforced. Otherwise you would not have such an iniquity as this packers' organization that bestrides the country, corners the food products of the land, and contemplates cornering the food of the world.

Is any such combination as that, which everybody must admit, which they have admitted upon the record, is unlawful and violates the criminal statutes, stronger than the Government? It is not if the power of the Government were set in motion; but if you have forces within the Government which paralyze the hand of the Executive and stay the execution of the law through the Department of Justice, then, Mr. President, crime can thrive.

There was a day when we had but a handful of these trusts and combinations in this country, and you all know it. They were then not more powerful than the Government. I have before reminded the country and the Senate, as I recall the fact, that in 1901, when through the assassination of President McKinley a change of administration came, there were but 149 combinations in this country, and they were perfectly easy to deal with. Seven years later there were 10,020, and the cost of living had mounted 70 per cent.

There have been half a dozen prosecutions a year, Mr. President; just enough to make a pretense of enforcing the law. They have had their way; they have become strong, until a President of the United States took the chances of his political life in his hands if he attempted to enforce the Sherman Act against them. That is the fact about it.

Do you say that, with the development of combinations and trusts in this country, to reverse all of the economic laws of commerce that have prevailed in the history of the human race for 5,000 years was a logical development? I deny it. It was an artificial creation with J. Pierpont Morgan and the rest of those men who defied all laws practically. How could that have fastened upon this country if you had not had a subservient administration that winked at it and permitted it and handed the people of the United States over to a servitude to the trusts and combinations?

The history of it is as plain as the mountain peaks. Congress has its share of the responsibility as well. It is confirmed. Attorneys General have been proposed with these same influences back of them.

Will anybody tell me it was not possible for this mighty Government of 80,000,000 people that we had then, the Army and Navy, the courts, all the majesty of power, to curb Rockefeller and Morgan and that handful of miscreants? All it needed was a President in the White House who would call over there to his office the United States district attorneys from every State in the Union and the Attorney General and say to them, "These combinations are forming in this country. You let them go too long and they will be stronger than the Government, and they will impose burdens upon the people that will make of this Government not a democracy but a plutocracy, with the wealth in the hands of a few, and this power will become stronger than the Government. You are charged with the enforcement of a law that says these things are wrong; that they are wicked; that they are unlawful; that they are criminal." And that wise man stood where I now stand, not one day only but for many days, pleading for the enactment of this law. He was wise in his day. I, a boy in the House of Representatives at the time, remember so well that I heard that there was a great speech on here, and in 1890 I came over here and I saw standing here the tall, spare figure of John Sherman, of Ohio, his head crowned with silvery locks, fighting for the principle of that law, modified in the course of the debate.

The debate did not end in one day. It ran on for days and days. Finally it came about that the House of Representatives was deserted, and Members of Congress thronged over here to listen to that debate. It was the greatest debate that had taken place in the Senate in a quarter of a century. It went on and on until finally there was developed out of it the antitrust law. Do you know Sherman and those of his coadjutors who framed that law—for it was changed in many particulars as Sherman introduced it—had the wisdom and the foresight to have written into that law a provision that you can not find in any other criminal statute in the United States? What is it? Criminal statutes, as a rule, define the offense and prescribe the penalty. They leave the administration of the law to the prosecuting attorney and the courts to settle the matter. But somebody wrote into the Sherman antitrust law this wise provision:

It shall be the duty of the Attorney General, through the United States district attorneys, to enforce this law.

Somebody wrote that into that law who realized that if the time ever came when this mighty power of combination clashed with the Government, it might be that they would have influence enough to put into the Department of Justice an Attorney General who would shrink from the performance of his duty, to say the least; and so they imposed upon him and upon his assistants, the United States district attorneys, the obligation pronounced affirmatively in the law of enforcing it.

Suppose during the time these combinations were organizing in the country and before they attained power that has made Senators tremble and Presidents bow we had had some President with the iron in him to summon his Attorney General and his United States district attorneys and to say to them: "You have so many of these unlawful combinations in this country; they are multiplying. This law makes it your duty to prosecute them and destroy them. Ninety days from to-day if there is one of them left in the United States I will take the head off of you, Mr. Attorney General, and of every district attorney in the country." Do you know what we would have had then? We would have had that law enforced; we would have had an end of this business; and we would have restored the natural laws of trade and commerce.

You have got now where Heney says this thing is so big you can not prosecute it criminally and get a conviction. It has got too much money. It has honeycombed society. It has undermined the Government. It has corrupted agencies everywhere. And now we are pottering along in an unsteady way, blindly, feebly, compromisingly, waiting for something to happen. A sort of paralysis seems to have taken hold of the Government, of the Executive, of the Congress.

Why, when President Wilson was elected six years ago there was a declaration in that platform that private monopoly should be abolished, that violations of the law would be prosecuted against criminal combinations; and all the years since that time the Packers' Trust has been multiplying its profits until they have mounted from something like fifteen or twenty million dollars to ninety million dollars or more; and so with all the other trusts and combinations; none of them have been put out of business.

Mr. President, I do not know what the end is to be, but I do believe that we must move with a degree of fairness and con-

sideration in dealing with the masses of the people of this country. When they complain of these conditions, do not come in here and propose a law that shall suppress their complaints. I tell you you are playing with mighty forces that may bring disaster upon us if you do that. If evils exist in this country, permit them to be talked about. That is the best way to correct it. If somebody indulges in wild and unreasoning and violent exhortation let him be answered. Permit, I would say, the widest discussion.

As I said to one of the Senators who came across the aisle to speak to me the other day about the terrible thing that had happened at Poli's Theater, and appealed to me to say something to avert a class war in this country, I would put an open stand on every open place in the city of Washington, and I would say to everybody, "Say what you please." Then I would say to everybody else, "Answer them." Error exposed can not long stand, unless it has a good foundation, and if we are guilty, if we have no defense for what we have done, it may be that we might incur some risk, Mr. President, upon the instant in permitting a full exposition of our shortcomings. However, I do not believe that. I believe that the wholesome cure for complaint is free discussion. The point where I would apply the power of the Government is where your discussion is translated into overt acts of violence, if we shall come to that. That will not come, Mr. President and Senators, I believe, if there be permitted the freest and fullest discussion in this country. If you are not going to permit it, I should like to have some one tell me who shall be arbiter as to what is proper to be said.

That is a branch of the discussion that I did not intend to trench upon. I purpose, possibly before the close of this session, if the trend of debate should invite me to it, to take up a discussion of the issues involved in free speech and democracy, fortified and supported by the fathers of the Constitution, by the men who wrote the resolutions of Kentucky and the Virginia resolutions, by all of the men who have stood for freedom from the foundation of this Government down to now.

Mr. President, I had greatly hoped that no point of order would be made against the amendment adding to the pay of these Government employees this little sum of \$120 per annum. Of course, in the aggregate I know it runs into the millions. It is the cost of a battleship or two; that is what it is. I will not go into those comparisons, Mr. President. I could extend them somewhat.

I am not going to oppose the amendment of the Senator who has asked the increase of the salary of the judge. Let him go along with the rest of them. At some time or other you will have put enough of these increases in the scale on the side of the "higher-ups" so that possibly you will make some additions to the other side that will not balance—I do not expect you to balance the scale—but it will be a little approach to justice.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate long, but after listening to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] I think it is only fair that the RECORD should show some facts.

The Senator from Wisconsin says in his statement that he was "sore." I am glad he puts it that way. He at least had gotten a long way away from the facts that controlled the framing of this bill. The Senator bases his argument on an appeal to class legislation, an attack on the increases in salaries that are made in this bill for judges.

The increases in salaries for judges contained in this bill were established by law. They are not the creation of our committee. This is a legislative bill, that carries the salaries of the Government officials. It is the business of our committee—and the Senator knows it is the business of that committee—to write into this bill the appropriations to pay the officers of the Government the salaries which it has been designated by law that they shall receive.

I was in the Senate Chamber when the bill increasing the salaries of the judges was passed. I did not observe the Senator from Wisconsin arise in his seat and hear him protest against the increase of those salaries. I do not know how he voted; but if he did not vote for that increase, at least his voice was silent in opposition to it.

The Senator would have those who read the RECORD believe that this Congress—the men who sit here before me—had just been guilty of raising their own salaries and then of refusing to take care of the clerical force of this Government. I will say to the Senator that the last increase in the salaries of Congressmen in this country was more than a decade ago, and that there are comparatively few men under the dome of this Capitol to-day who had seats in the Congress of the United States when that increase was made.

The Senator from Wisconsin was a Member of Congress at that time, and so was I. When the provision for an increase of salary to Members of Congress came before the other House,

of which I was then a Member, I voted against that increase. I am not informed as to how the Senator from Wisconsin cast his vote in this body under similar circumstances.

However, the provisions of this bill, whether for Congressmen or judges, have been fixed by law, and it was the duty of our committee to report the appropriation bill to pay these men their salaries, lest the Government should fail to perform the functions for which it is organized; and possibly some people in the United States would be glad to see it fail to perform its necessary functions.

Now, as to the salaries of the clerical force of the Government, while the Senator, like the Pharisee, would like to wrap his cloak about him and thank God that he is better than other men, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin that he is not the only man in this Chamber who has a sincere desire to uplift humanity and assist those who struggle each day for their daily bread; but the men in whose hands is intrusted the real business of this Government, the men who must sustain the flag in times of peace as well as in times of war, must consider the business interests of this Government and not what they can gather unto themselves by abusing their colleagues.

The Senator states that it has been ascertained how much money is necessary to support a family, and because this bill carries on the pay roll certain employees who only receive \$420 a year, then, forsooth, we are not paying these people enough to support their families. The Senator knows, as well as I do, that that statement is not sincere. The Senator has been a Member of this body longer than almost any man who sits in this Chamber, and he knows, as well as I do, that the people whose compensation is fixed in this bill at \$420 a year are those who only render partial service to the Government or are paid for piecework. The Senator knows, as well as I do, that the most of the \$420 class of employees carried in this bill are the charwomen—some of them getting as low as \$240—who only spend a few hours in the Government service and then earn a compensation outside of the Government service. The Government employment is merely a matter of assistance to them, and not their daily vocation.

If the great committees in charge of the legislation of this Government were to allow their sentiments and their desires and their effort for popular acclaim to control their handling of the affairs of the Government in connection with these great supply bills we would have no Government before long, because it would put the burden of taxes upon the people so great that they could not carry it. It is not the John D. Rockefellers and the Pierpont Morgans who pay the great taxes in this country, and the Senator knows it. They may pay a large amount of money so far as they are individually concerned, but it is a mere drop in the bucket compared with the immense amount of taxes that rest on the masses of the people. The toiling people of this country pay the taxes and support this Government, and unless the Government is honestly and economically administered that burden can not be borne.

This provision was subject to a point of order and could have been stricken from the bill; but members of the Appropriations Committee, whom I happen to represent at this time, being in charge of this bill, do not occupy the position that the Senator from Wisconsin would place them in, that they are reckless in their desire to oppress humanity; that they are unwilling to listen to the appeals of those who need these salaries; but the committee sat down with deliberation and tried to work out a system of increases for the clerks of this Government that would be reasonable and just, that would take care of the increased cost of living, and at the same time have some due regard to the burden which the taxpayers of this country have to bear.

Last year we gave the clerks an increase of \$120 a year, or \$10 a month. This year, with a falling price of living—at least, there is every reason to believe the cost of living from July on will fall below war prices—the committee reports an increase of \$240; and, although I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, I have not any doubt in my own mind, although I may be mistaken, that if the committee had reported in favor of an increase of \$360 the Senator from Wisconsin would have been desirous of adding another \$120 to it to enable him to make his speech.

So far as the Senator's economic argument is concerned, that has no part in this bill. The Senator brings a general indictment against a half dozen men who within the last two decades have been Presidents of the United States, men chosen by the American people, men of great ability and standing in the Nation. So far as I am concerned, I am not prepared to admit that part of his indictment.

As to the Government of this country, I want to say but one word. This is a free Government, and has been for 130 years. The people of the United States govern this country, not a

governing class or rulers. There never has been a government organized in this world of ours where the final sentiments of the people who were governed, in the last analysis, were more freely, thoroughly, and completely respected in the legislative bodies that made the laws of the country. Sometimes the Congress may be slow to act, but I have never seen the time yet when the crystallized sentiment of the American people was prepared to announce itself in favor of any question that Congress did not register the will of the people and did not write it into the law of the land.

We need no Bolshevik sentiment in this country that our people may be free. We need no Soviet government to live under in order that we may better our condition. We need no bomb throwers or anarchists under the Stars and Stripes of this country in order that the will of the American people may be reflected in the law of this land; and no such sentiment exists in this country, no matter what the Senator from Wisconsin may dream.

The people of every country want changes as time goes by. There are changes which must affect the Nation, progressive changes of great magnitude; but they will not come from the reflected will of the Bolsheviks. They will come from the sober, deliberate judgment of the great American people, reflected in the laws that will be passed by the Congresses of the future.

When a government could produce 4,000,000 soldiers, not only the pride of our land but the admiration of the world, who could win the fight for the cause of democracy and for the right of self-determination under the Government that was founded by their fathers and their fathers' fathers, you can not tell me that those 4,000,000 men are coming back to America to allow a mob to make the laws and rule the land. The Senator is mistaken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE].

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, as there are a number of Senators present who were not in the Chamber when I presented this amendment, I want to say one word in explanation of it.

When the bill increasing the salaries of the judges was before the Senate, the salaries of all the district judges, amongst others, were increased, including the salaries of the district judges of Porto Rico and the Hawaiian Islands; but it seems that the district judge in Panama was overlooked. He was the only one in all the number of judges whose salary was not increased; and it is to correct that that I have presented this amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a word in answer to what the Senator from Wisconsin has so graphically depicted.

I say now that among the 100,000 employees in the city of Washington there are perhaps 90 per cent of them receiving more salaries than they ever received before in their lives, and many of them you could not drive away from the positions that they hold with a Gatling gun. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Order must be preserved in the galleries.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say that not only are they receiving the wages I have referred to, but they are allowed 30 days' leave of absence, and, in addition, a sick leave; they are working seven hours a day, and I can take you into a department where there are over 5,000 girls employed, drawing \$1,100, \$1,200, and \$1,320 a year. Now, we have added \$240 more, and I say now that I do not think that half of them ever worked for a salary before, and in case they did, many of them never received a salary of more than \$30 a month. I am tired, Mr. President, of having it said that the Government of the United States is having people labor for a mere pittance.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMOOT. Just a moment. I want to say in this connection that there are other employees of this Government who are not receiving what they ought to receive. It is the system that is wrong. It ought to be corrected. But is it the fault of the Committee on Appropriations? How often have I stood upon this floor and called attention to this matter? How often have we asked for legislation, and how often have we been defeated in it? I say, Mr. President, that until there is a thorough investigation and reorganization from top to bottom there will be these inequalities and injustices that no one can defend.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I do not think the Senator intended to make the reflection upon the young women who have come here to do this work which his remark would naturally mean, when he says that very few of these young women—the majority

of them capable, educated, many of them I know from my own State being graduates of leading educational institutions—that very few of them received more than \$30 a month before they came here. I think that is rather unwarranted, rather unjust, rather unkind. They are not of the cheap class of people. They are splendid young women; they are serving their country and rendering good service and they are entitled to fair compensation; and I know the Senator from Utah is in favor of giving it to them himself.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator from Mississippi that I stated that some of the 50 per cent of the employees I referred to I did not think had received more than \$30 a month before coming here; and I want to ask the Senator from Mississippi if half of the young women who are employed in the bureau I referred to who came from Mississippi received more of a salary per month than I stated?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Oh, I think they received very much more, because a great many of them were school-teachers.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and a great many of them were not, I will say to the Senator. The Senator and I have the same feeling toward all of mankind and womankind. I would not do an injustice to anyone.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Oh, I know the Senator would not.

Mr. SMOOT. But I want to say to the Senator now that if he will go down to some of the departments when they leave their work and see the girls that could not have had very much experience in the work they are called upon to do, coming out of the departments dressed as they never dressed before, wearing apparel that they never wore before [laughter in the galleries]—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will warn the occupants of the galleries that the Sergeant at Arms will be instructed to clear the galleries unless the occupants refrain from making demonstrations of any kind.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Chair that the disorder is in the Chamber more than in the galleries.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to say to the Senator that I had no idea that these young women were living in such affluence. I have not seen any evidence of it; and I do not think a young woman can come here and pay forty or fifty or sixty dollars a month for board, and then dress so handsomely, and go about decked with diamonds and satin and fine linen, on \$100 a month.

Mr. SMOOT. I have said nothing about diamonds, nor have I said anything about satin or fine linens in any way. I am in earnest in this matter. I do not want Members of Congress to be branded as a lot of ingrates and have it said that they are not doing justice to the employees of the Government. That is all that I have in view at this time, and I think I am well within bounds in what I have said. Do I object to seeing them dress in the best possible style? Why, no; but, Mr. President, when we consider a question we ought to consider it as it really exists; and I want to say to Senators that the committee is not asking any employees of the Government to work all the time for \$400 a year. I know that the charwomen that work for that amount only work about three hours a day, and I know that many of them are also employed elsewhere, because I have employed them as washwomen for \$2 a day, and they have been filling both positions, and are making more money to-day than they ever made before; so I would not want it to appear in any way, shape, or form that the Government of the United States was paying a salary of only \$400 to regular employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE].

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, just a moment, if you please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. First, Mr. President, I think I will just set the Senate at rest about the vote on the increase of the salaries of Senators and Members of Congress, concerning which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] delivered himself. I happen to have the roll call here, and I think it may be gratifying to Senators to have it written down again in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

When the vote to increase the salaries of Senators was taken in the Senate the roll call showed the following Senators voting in favor of increasing their salaries and the following Senators voting against it. I do not happen to have the vote in the House of Representatives; and I take the Senator's word, of course, for the fact that he is on record there against an increase of his salary. I understand from Senators about me that there was no roll call in the House.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have been told so.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the Senator that I think he is mistaken.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But even if there was not a roll call, if the Senator from Alabama tells me that he voted against it, that is just as good as a roll call.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, there was a roll call, and the Senator from Alabama voted against it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not care whether there was or not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My recollection is very clear that there was a roll call.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator does not need to be corroborated. His word is just as good with me as his bond could be.

Mr. OVERMAN. When was it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not question the Senator or his motives.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I was not trying to corroborate the Senator from Alabama. I was merely—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have not gotten down to personalities in this debate, and I do not propose to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My recollection is that there was no roll call.

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, yes; there was, because I voted for it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Well, let it go at that. The Senator has put himself on record, and I know he has put himself on record right. He is above any subterfuge and I think above any demagoguery. I am pretty liberal.

When the subject of increasing the pay of employees was before the Senate two years ago I took occasion at that time to review the fact that Senators who had voted against any increase in the salaries of employees of the Government who were on meager earnings here had voted to increase their own salaries, and I read into the RECORD at that time the roll call from the RECORD of the date when the roll call was taken.

Mark you, with all the defense, eloquence, and caustic comment which has been interwoven here by the Senator from Alabama regarding the readiness of Congress to respond to the demands upon it, there was voted down two years ago every increase that had been proposed to the salaries of employees. It had occurred upon bill after bill as it had come into the Senate of the United States. I can not recall now just how many times the Senate has gone on record against an increase in the salaries of the employees of the Government, but it has gone on record repeatedly in the face of all the testimony showing the justice of such increase at that time, a year ago, notwithstanding the Senator's approval of Congress as always being so responsive to the right thing.

Senators may recall that the Senate again and again voted down that increase of a certain percentage, 5 and 10 per cent, two years ago, on bill after bill, as it had been presented here, covering the employees of different departments. Finally there came before the Senate here one night the Indian appropriation bill in the form of a conference report, and it happened that I had gathered together a lot of data upon the subject, not only of increases that Senators had voted to themselves, but the increases they had voted to various other highly salaried public officials. Furthermore, I had prepared by the statistician of the Bureau of Labor a record of the past salaries of the employees of this Government.

I may state that too broadly, and I do not wish to be in error in any respect; but at least I am safe in saying that the employees of the Treasury Department were covered by the data that he furnished me. That data I read before the Senate that night. Do you remember what it showed? It showed that since 1855 there had not been an increase of the wages of the employees of the Treasury Department. It is not necessary for me to say, Senators, that the same thing prevails with regard to other departments of the Government, because you do not raise the salaries of the employees of one department without raising the salaries of employees of another department.

But, Mr. President, the matter which I presented in a 20 or 30 minute speech that night to the United States Senate was so appealing, taken together with the roll call of their own vote for increasing their own salaries, that I succeeded in getting a vote in favor of adopting on the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill an increase of 5 and 10 per cent to employees then in the office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Do you see what followed that? The fact that that was voted that night put the salaries of the employees of that bureau on a higher level than the employees of other bureaus and other departments of the Government. So it led logically to raising the salaries of the employees of all the other departments. As it finally worked out in the various Congresses it gave a salary raise of \$120 a year, which was called a bonus. It was not a salary raise; it is not something that will con-

tinue. It is just a sort of gift temporarily to tide over these times when prices are high and people are complaining about the cost of living. Do not let any employee of the Government fancy that he has gotten a permanent statutory increase in his salary, because he has not. The salaries, as I understand it, stand by law and statute just where they did first in 1855. You have not done anything more for these people who work for the Government. You have done something more for yourselves. My friend from Alabama, or the Senator from Alabama—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the Senator I do not want any doubt in the RECORD as to my statement. If the Senator will allow me, I should like to refer him to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 1, part 1, of the Fifty-ninth Congress, second session, when the proposition was pending before the House to increase the salaries from \$5,000 to \$7,500. On page 383 he will find a statement in which I said, as it appears in the RECORD, that I opposed the resolution, and on page 389 he will find the record vote, where I voted against the resolution. I merely wanted to have the RECORD show that at this time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. All right; let the RECORD show it. It was not necessary at all, so far as that was concerned, or so far as any other Senator is concerned. Anybody will take the word of the Senator from Alabama as to any statement of fact.

I know Senators are weary of this discussion and anxious to dispose of this bill, but I am going to pursue this matter for a little time, and they have to be patient about it or take their impatience to the cloakroom.

And I do not claim any particular credit for it, but the brief appeal I made that night—I think, Senators, it was about as late as to-night—reminding them of how much they had increased their own salaries and the conditions that existed among these employees, led to the adoption, as I have stated before, of the conference report upon the Indian appropriation bill and established irrevocably an increase in the salaries of the employees in that bureau.

The other appropriation bills followed in due order, and there was an adjustment made so that \$120 finally came to be added to the salaries of the employees of the Government.

I remember in the discussion that night, in appealing to Senators, I had turned to the old CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the salary increase, and since the Senator from Alabama has raised the question as to how I might have voted at that time, I take the liberty of reading into the RECORD the vote on that occasion as I read it into the RECORD two years ago. The yeas were 53, the nays were 21. Those who voted in favor of the increase were the following Senators, then Members of this body: Aldrich, Alee, Ankeny, Benson, Beveridge, Brandegee, Bulkeley, Burnham, Burrows, Carter, Clark (Mont.), Clark (Wyo.), Clarke (Ark.), Crane, Cullom, Daniel, Dick, Dillingham, Dubois, du Pont, Flint, Foraker, Foster, Frye, Fulton, Gallinger, Hale, Heyburn, Hopkins, Kittredge, Knox, Latimer, Lodge, Long, McCumber, McEnery, Millard, Money, Newlands, Nixon, Overman, Penrose, Pettus, Piles, Scott, Simmons, Smoot, Spooner, Sutherland, Teller, Tillman, Warner, Warren.

Those who voted "nay" were as follows: Bacon, Berry, Blackburn, Burkett, Carmack, Clapp, Clay, Culberson, Frazier, Hansbrough, Hemenway, La Follette, McCreary, Mallory, Nelson, Patterson, Perkins, Rayner, Stone, Taliaferro, Whyte.

Not voting—16, as follows: Alger, Allison, Bailey, Depew, Dolliver, Dryden, Elkins, Gamble, Gearin, Kean, McLaurin, Martin, Morgan, Platt, Proctor, Wetmore.

The calling of that roll at this time is an admonition to all of us of the mutations of time. Not many of the Senators who were Members of this body in 1905 when that roll was called survive in this year 1919. Fourteen years have gone by.

Mr. President, I would not have recurred to that roll call except for the observations of the Senator from Alabama. I am not going to detain the Senate to-night.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I merely stated to the Senator that I was not informed as to how he voted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understand; and I read the roll call in order that the Senator might be informed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am glad to have the information.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did not want to leave the Senator in any doubt upon that subject.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield, of course.

Mr. SMOOT. Two years ago when the vote was taken for the increase of salaries, I think the first time the amendment was agreed to it was on one of the appropriation bills—the legisla-

tive, as I remember—but in the conference they would not agree to it and sent it back here. The House would not agree to the amendment offered by the Senate. The Senator knows I did what little I could to secure that legislation and fought for the amendment at that time.

While it is true that I voted in 1905 for an increase of salaries for Senators and Congressmen, I take it for granted that anybody in the United States would feel that a Senator who did his duty was worth that amount of money.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not suggesting; I have not raised the question here; I have not intimated that the increase of salaries of judges was not proper; I have not intimated that the increase of the salaries of the Senators was not proper. I simply took the position, so far as I am concerned myself, that I would not vote for an increase of salary during the term for which I was elected. I felt that my services were worth more than \$5,000 a year—the amount of salary at that time. I never have played that sort of a demagogic game with the public. You can not find anywhere a suggestion from me that the increases in salaries to which I have called attention here to-night are unjust or improper. I realize the fact that the very conditions to which I have called attention here to-night, the iniquitous conditions that have been permitted to grow up under a free democratic Government, increasing unjustly and unlawfully the cost of living upon the American people, made it necessary that if a man is going to live within his salary and be honest he has got to have an increase commensurate with the increases that these unlawful combinations are able to put upon him.

It is very far from me to offer such a suggestion, and the suggestion of the Senator from Alabama that my attitude has been one of hostility for the purpose of raising class prejudice here to these increases in salaries is very unjust upon his part. Never can you find a word in the Record on my part making an appeal of that sort.

I want to answer the Senator upon another question, and that is that the American Congress has been responsive to the will of the people of this country. I say it is not, and the record shows it is not. It is now a quarter past 9. I should like to spend three or four hours on the record of Congress, to demonstrate that Congress has defied public opinion, that Congress has responded to the public and the demands for just legislation in the United States by the public only when it has been driven into it. That is going pretty strong.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the Senator, if he will allow me—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will just recount some instances.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will allow me to say this—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will yield, of course.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Every man in this Congress holds his commission from a constituency.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, yes; of course.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Few of those constituencies are controlled by corrupt motives. When a sentiment in this country has crystallized in favor of any great constructive legislation I have never seen the time when the Congress of the United States did not respond. I do not say that Congress was always in advance of public opinion, but I say the time has never been when it has not followed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; I think that is true, but it has followed it a long way behind. It has not been within speaking distance of it.

Postmaster General Creswell, under the Grant administration, recommended to begin with the postal-savings banks, and it took 40 years of campaigning over this country, organized among the farmers and among the laboring men and various organizations of the country, to get them.

To trace that out in all its detail would take some time. I had the matter at one time well and thoroughly in mind. But, Mr. President, it took some 40 years to drive Congress into a response. Every Postmaster General for a number of years after Postmaster General Creswell argued and plead with Congress for that legislation. There were powerful interests opposed to it, and those powerful interests were more potential apparently, judged by the result, than were the appeals of the administration and the arguments of the Postmaster General and the petitions of millions of people that the files of the Congress will show were presented here in favor of that legislation—to get Congress to respond to the will of the people and enact that legislation. Of course, the national banks were opposed to the postal-savings banks. I suppose I will shock the Senator from Alabama. We have had a great many men holding

seats behind these curved lines here who were the owners of national-bank stock. I do not suppose that had any influence on their votes, but they did not enact that legislation. It took a long time to get it. It is pretty discouraging when you have to make a campaign of 40 years to enact a piece of legislation. It was so just and wise and unobjectionable, there was never any argument to be made against it, and there never was any argument made against it. It simply stood still here. Congress was stolid and indifferent.

So, Mr. President, with the parcels post. Organized bodies all over this country plead with Congress through twenty-odd years of time for a parcels post. The express companies did not want it. At that time United States Senators had express franks in their pockets. Do you call that democracy? You tell me that the United States Congress has always been responsive to the will of the people as soon as that will was crystallized? Away with such an answer as that! It is trifling with the facts of history.

Talk about playing the demagogue to the people! There is such a thing as playing the demagogue to the interests.

Take your food legislation. It took 17 years of campaign to enact a law to prevent manufacturers of adulterated food from poisoning the people of this country. Every woman's club in America was enlisted in the campaign. Every grange organization in the United States was lined up for it. The farmers' unions throughout the country were asking for legislation to prevent the adulteration of food. Think of it! My God, think of it! People manufacturing food and using chemicals to impose upon the people rotten meats, decayed vegetables, poisoned foods of various sorts, and they were potential enough to cause delay here. Why, my God, the suggestion of such legislation ought to have seen its immediate enactment here. But committee of Congress after committee hung it up. You tell me that democracy has had expression in this country? I deny that here on the floor of the United States Senate in this year 1919, and I tell you you have got to give it expression; you have got to make democracy responsive to the will of the people. That is what this Government was made for; that is what it meant. The building up—the establishment—of this Government was that it should be responsive to the will of the people.

So long as your Government is that kind of a government you need not fear the proselytes of any government on earth coming in here to overturn it.

Do not intimate that I am here seeking to overthrow democracy. I have done as much as you or any other man living in this country to preserve democracy in the United States and to keep it clean and to make it responsive to the will of the people. I will no longer permit any man to asperse my loyalty to this country, to this Government. I have sacrificed as much surely as has the Senator from Alabama. I have fought on the side of the weak, not of the strong.

Look at it again. In 1870 the railroads of this country were running the Government as they pleased. They were building up towns here, destroying communities there, charging for freight what they would. They were controlling the iron highways of commerce as the banditti controlled the highways that led to London when Dick Turpin and his ilk were in the saddle. The railroad organizations of the country at that time said that they owned those roads and they had a right to do what they pleased with them; that it was their privilege to establish a toll-gate on every iron highway to market, and to charge the products of the country, as they went down over their lines seeking sale, whatever they pleased; that they had built the roads. Do you know that that theory was pretty generally accepted in the country?

However, up in the upper waters of the Mississippi Valley was an unusual type of people. We are just now scorning the people that come from the other side; we are preparing to build bulwarks against immigration; we are planning to formulate all manner of legislation against foreigners; but, Mr. President, the upper waters of the Mississippi Valley cradled the most progressive democracy of the world. The State of Wisconsin, the State of Minnesota, the State of Iowa, and the State of Illinois came into the Union about the same time.

Wisconsin came into the Union in 1848. Just at that time there was sweeping over all of Europe a wave of what we in this day would call Prussianism; a wave of the oppression of the iron hand of empire. I guess that is a mixed metaphor, but it will have to go in the hurry of the occasion. The revolution headed by Carl Schurz and others had occurred in Germany. Poland had been partitioned. The coup d'état had been executed in France. Everywhere, in Hungary and all the rest, they were under the oppressive hand of empire.

What was the result? The highest tide of immigration that this country has ever seen swept out of Europe at that time.

What was the class of people that came? People who wanted liberty such as they could not get under empire. They were democrats. They wanted freedom. They came over to the United States.

Just then the upper Mississippi Valley was opened to settlement. Wisconsin had been admitted to the Union in 1848. There was organized in New York City a society that flooded all Germany with literature appealing to the refugees of the revolution of 1848 to come to America, to go up into Wisconsin, and to establish a free democratic State.

That foundation stock that settled in Wisconsin and Minnesota and Illinois and Iowa, along the Lakes and the upper waters of the Mississippi, were in part made up of the emigrants from Europe who came at the time of that exodus; so that, Mr. President, mingling their blood with the pioneer stock that came from New England, there was built up in that section of our country the most progressive, advanced, and thoroughly democratic and liberty-loving people that I think—and you will pardon my provincialism—you can find in the United States.

So, Mr. President, right there was born the idea that you had a right to control the iron highways that lead to market; and that you could not have any free government if those highways were controlled by private enterprise; that the fact that they led to the markets of the country made them subject to public control. Old farmers following the plow worked out the principle based upon the idea of the public highway. They said, "You have a right to take a man's land to make a public highway; you have a right to take it against his will, paying him what it is worth, whether he will or no. That power is a public power that rises out of a public necessity, that public necessity being that you must have highways." Then, they said, "These railroads have been given by the States that chartered them the power to take our land and build railroads on that land; they have taken our land against our consent and at a price fixed by the public upon which to build those roads; therefore they can not be private property; they must be public property; the public must have an interest in them; and the railroads must be subject to some public control because of the public character of the property which is vested in them by this power of eminent domain which they have." That was the reasoning of the farmers in the progressive northwestern section of the country.

Did you know that that is where you got your interstate commerce law? Do you know that in those four States up there at the head of the Mississippi Valley they enacted the first law ever enacted in the history of the world asserting the rights of the public to control transportation charges upon railroads? It was resisted by the railroads. The great Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad Co., with Alexander Mitchell, its wonderful president and founder and the most progressive railroad man of his time, defied the power of the State and threatened to arm his employees to resist. He said, "This is private property; you can not do this thing." That was the opinion of the time. Just see how far ahead were those people of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois! It looked as if we were going to have a civil war in Wisconsin, but do you know what happened? The governor said to the attorney general: "Start a suit and get it into court." A suit was started to test the validity of the law that gave the State the right to regulate their transportation rates within the State. It was taken into court, and it went before the Supreme Court of Wisconsin when we had only three judges on the bench, but God was good to us and good to this country, for we happened to have at that time on the bench the greatest man who ever sat on the supreme bench of the State of Wisconsin and the peer of any man who ever sat on any bench in this country—Edward G. Ryan. He wrote the opinion in that case, and it was a wonderful opinion. Like a torch in the darkness it lighted the way. The Supreme Court of the United States followed it a little later. It settled forever the question of the right of the people, through their legislatures, to control and regulate the iron highways to market.

Mr. President, that was away back in 1871 or 1872. I am coming down now to the responsiveness of Congress to the crystallized sentiment of the country. I will make haste, Senators, for I do not wish to delay the consummation of the pending legislation; but the Senator from Alabama set some things going in my mind. The case decided by Ryan came to the Supreme Court of the United States; it was affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States, and forever settled the right of the Government to control, through its legislative branches, the commerce of the country, the State governments to control intrastate commerce and to regulate the processes of intrastate commerce, and the Federal Government to control and regulate the processes of interstate commerce and the regu-

lation of the operation of the roads. That power was given to the Federal Government at that time as the result of that progressive movement up in those Northwestern States.

Now, mark you. Do you know what was behind that? As the Senator from Oklahoma suggests to me—and I might have missed it—the grangers. Do you know that is the first time the granger organization ever was made potential? Why, it started up there; it was born up there; it has lived ever since; it has its organization in every State in the Union; but the grange movement of that time ripened into legislation in those four States. Do you know that in the State of Wisconsin we elected a granger for governor, who signed that law? So, to the farmers this country owes the inception of the idea, and the consummation of it in legislation, that the Government has a right to control the railroads.

Now, come down a little bit. This wonderful decision by the Supreme Court, based upon that wonderful decision by Chief Justice Edward G. Ryan—which covers, I think, three-fourths of an entire volume of the Wisconsin Reports—pointed the way to Congress like a guideboard on a highway. The decisions of the Supreme Court, based upon the Granger cases, pointed the way that Congress should go. The Supreme Court said:

Congress has the power to regulate railway transportation and railway services. It has the right to determine three things: First, that it is the duty of the railroads to furnish adequate services; second, that it is the duty of the railroads to furnish equal services to all; third, that it is the duty of the railroads to furnish services at reasonable rates.

Those are the three great fundamental and underlying principles with regard to railroad regulation. That is what a common carrier assumes when it takes private property for public use. It assumes the responsibility of furnishing adequate services, equal services to all, no privileges to anybody, reasonable rates to everybody.

I say that decision, the last of those decisions in 1874, stood there like a guideboard on the highways, pointing the way for the Representatives of the people in the United States Senate and in the Congress to enact the legislation necessary to control interstate commerce. Why, we had our State commissions up there at that time in those Northwestern States suggesting what was necessary. Did the United States Senate and did the House of Representatives respond to the Supreme Court decision? If this had been a representative Government, if Congress had been always ready to respond to the public need and to the public desire, would we not have had that legislation pretty promptly? Why, Mr. President, volumes were written regarding the need of a Federal commission to regulate the railroads. There was no doubt about it. I do not know about the eastern and southern country; but from all that western country there was a perfect flood tide of petitions appealing to Congress to enact that legislation. That decision in 1874, and the other decision that followed it, informed the people that they could not regulate by State legislation; that they were stopped at the boundaries of the State; that they had to have this Federal legislation; and immediately delegations from State after State came marching down here. Petitions were circulated all over the United States, and appeals began to be made to Congress to enact legislation to stop the extortionate charges that were being made upon the people to get their goods to market.

What happened? Oh, Mr. President, talk about Congress being responsive! It took 13 long years of pleading and begging and appealing, people appearing here, delegations of farmers coming before the committees of Congress. One hundred and six different bills introduced by Members were defeated one after another or smothered to death in the committees. You could not get anything reported out. It took 13 long years, from 1874 to 1887, before you could get anything enacted. The railroads dominated the Congress of the United States; and any man who will read history with an impartial and open mind will admit it.

Are you going to organize an investigation of every meeting that makes a little complaint about something that is wrong in this country, and are you going to frame a statute to gag the people of this country who protest that everything has not been absolutely right? Oh, look at the history of your country; look at the records of Congress, and you will stay your hand before you do it.

Finally the railroad lobbies swarmed the Capitol. Why, the reports of the committees disclose that fact. Finally, Senator Cullom made a report to the Senate in favor of a bill, and the bill was enacted in 1887; but the same thing occurred that always occurs. When any great power in this country is pursued by public opinion because of its wrongdoing, it resists corrective legislation as long as possible; and when the clock strikes, and it sees that the hour can no longer be postponed, what does it do? It calls in its best attorneys, and it says to the committees,

"We are not opposed to this legislation any longer, but we want to suggest that you write in so-and-so, and so-and-so, and so-and-so, and so-and-so." [Laughter.] "We know you want to be fair about this thing"—about these oil-land leases, for instance, and this water-power business. "We know you want to be fair." That is just a bit of digression, having application to something that is coming up pretty soon.

And so do you know that they wrote into the law of 1887 such changes as pulled the teeth all out of it and made it of no value? They created a commission, but they created a commission which was a sore disappointment to the public and largely lessened public interest; and finally the commission said to Congress—and I want you to follow me here, because I am coming to something that tests the responsiveness of Congress to the will of the people in pretty good shape, in a pretty unanswerable way.

The Interstate Commerce Commission found out after a while how helpless it was. Of course, it tried to apply power, and it went to the Supreme Court, and the law was construed just as the adroit and clever railway attorneys knew that it would be when they wrote the suggestions of amendment into it; and the Supreme Court said: "You have not the power that you thought you had." So, finally, the Interstate Commerce Commission—now, I shall have to trust to my memory, and I may get a date wrong here, and if I do I am going to exercise the right to correct it—but, according to my recollection, it was about 1903 that the Interstate Commerce Commission got its eyes sufficiently open so that in its report to Congress it said: "Under the decisions of the Supreme Court we are utterly helpless to render the public any service." Now, I am not quoting the exact language, but I am giving you the import of what they said to you people who were then here. "There is no power in the Interstate Commerce Commission to make rates reasonable unless you give us the power to find out the value of railroad property, and we appeal to the Congress of the United States to give us that power."

That was in 1903. Now then, I am going to test the formula of the Senator from Alabama that Congress is responsive to the will of the people. There was laid upon your desk, if you were a Member of that Congress in 1903, and that of every other Member of the House, and every United States Senator, an appeal from the Interstate Commerce Commission to you to give them the power to get the valuation of railroad property, in order that they might make the interstate-commerce act effective for the purpose for which it was designed.

What did you do with it? Did you pass a law authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to ascertain the value of railroad property? Why, do you not see how essential it was? They could not be guided by the capitalization. The capitalization was a lie. Everybody knew it was a lie. And the Supreme Court, in the Ames case, had said that fictitious and fraudulent capitalization can not be made the basis of rates. Everybody knew that there was water in the railroad securities of the country. They said, "We can not be guided by the stocks that have been issued. What we have to do is to ascertain the true, fair value of the property, judged by what they have invested in it, judged by every element that will test what will constitute true, fair value."

That was in 1903. Did you do anything? You did not—not a single, solitary thing. You did not raise a hand. Mark you, it was back in 1874 that this thing started. It was in 1903 that you were appealed to by this Interstate Commerce Commission that you had set up and that you had authorized to report to Congress and tell Congress what legislation was needed, for right in the law under which they were created it was provided that this commission should annually tell Congress what legislation they needed in order to better fulfill their functions. Here they came in 1903 and appealed to the Congress of the United States to enact legislation giving them the power to ascertain the value of this railroad property, in order that they might use that as a basis for determining what rates the people ought to pay.

That was in 1903. Nineteen hundred and four came; and because you had ignored their appeals, because you had not been responsive, because the petitions that had been sent down here, stirred up by all of the commercial organizations that had read this report by the Interstate Commerce Commission, fell upon deaf ears—because of all that, the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1904 again, in more emphatic terms, appealed to Congress to give them this power.

I must not go so much into detail. Let me sum it up by telling you that in 1904, 1905, and 1906 that same appeal came at the beginning of every session. There was laid upon the desk of every Senator and every Member of Congress a bound volume from the Interstate Commerce Commission, asking you to

give them the power to value railroads, as the only way of making effective this regulation of railroad rates.

At the risk of incurring the criticism of the Senator from Alabama, though he is using his powers of invective and sarcasm to designate me as a Pharisee, I venture to quote a little history. I came to the Senate on the 4th day of January, 1906. In April, 1906, I made a speech from my desk here in the Senate, in what was then called "the Cherokee strip." I spoke for a couple of hours on that day. I happen to remember it was the day of the earthquake in California, for I had hoped possibly with the facts I put into the RECORD that it would get some publicity over the country and would help to get the legislation I was trying to get the Senate to enact; but it did not; it was utterly wiped out by that important event.

That was not vanity—that is, I do not think it was. It may be that it was. I really wanted some results. I had been engaged in a contest regarding this same thing up in Wisconsin that had covered a period of 9 or 10 years, and I was very much interested in it. For two days in succession, two hours in each day, beginning with only one Senator sitting here when I commenced my talk, I had the attention of a pretty good body of the Senate before I concluded. My chief appeal was to give heed to this repeated request of the Interstate Commerce Commission to give them power to value the railroad property of the country. Then I presented an amendment and asked for a roll call on it. Mark you, I had called the attention of the Senate to every one of these recommendations one after another, and had read them here in the Senate. You would have thought that if the Senate of the United States was really responsive to the public demand, the great body of men they had approved and had clothed with power suggesting to them every change in the law that ought to be made, here was a change in the law so plain that a wayfaring man or a fool would know that it was necessary. The railroads did not want it because they wanted rates based on watered stock; but the Interstate Commerce Commission and the public wanted rates based on true value.

Do you know what response I got from the Senate of the United States on a roll call for my amendment? I have not the figures in mind; I only remember that there were but seven Republican Senators who voted for it. I got more Democratic Senators than I did Republican Senators, because the Republican Senators were in the majority and some of the Democrats knew it would do no harm to vote for it, but it would make a pretty good record anyway to take home to the folks.

That was in 1906. In 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, every time a bill was presented to the Senate where I had an opportunity to offer that proposition I offered it and made an appeal and quoted not only that but succeeding appeals of the Interstate Commerce Commission for that legislation, because they kept on asking for it year after year; and it was not until the thing got so crystallized that the Senate thought they had better pass it. Do you know that then they passed it unanimously? The last vote before that it had been defeated overwhelmingly.

That is another instance of the responsiveness of Congress. It took from 1903 to 1913, only 10 years. You can get Congress to respond to something everybody is in favor of if you only try hard enough and live long enough.

Mr. President, I know that I am overtesting the patience of the Senators. The Senator caught me up on this \$420 salary. I believe I did mention that \$420 salary. I believe the Senator from Utah dwelt at some length upon that \$420 salary.

I knew that the charwomen did not work 8 or 10 or 12 hours a day; but how about the \$620 and the \$720 salaries, that did not reach up to the cost of maintaining a family, or the \$900 salaries, that are only \$20 above the cost of maintaining a family in 1914, as established by a scientific investigation at New York, in which—and I have the table here before me—only \$20 was allowed for medicine and doctor bills?

There is no use dwelling upon this thing. You have made your record. The committee was appealed to to make this \$360 increase. It did not do it. It brought in the bill in a form in which no amendment could be proposed here which under our rules could be considered by the Senate, and therefore we could not have it tried out by the Senate. Therefore we have given to these people with these meager salaries an increase of \$120 a year over the salaries which they have been drawing to meet the increased cost of living that has resulted in the last year.

The Senator from Alabama is very hopeful that prices are going to decline. Of course, he does not guarantee it and he will not be around to make up any losses to you if they do not happen to decline. I hope they may decline, but I have been glancing over the testimony given by the Armour-Swift combination before the Committee on Agriculture of the United States

Senate, and it does not hold out much hope to me that there will be a decline. I very much fear that you will find at the end of the year prices in some respects higher than they were at the beginning of the year.

I wish to apologize to Senators and to the Senate for taking time to-night to talk about matters upon which we can have no direct vote at this time, but that is a fault all of us have. There has been a good deal of discussion on this and other bills upon issues and problems that may be helpful to us as we pass along our legislative way. I do not want to be vain, but I hope that I may have made some appeal here to-night that will lead Senators perhaps to be patient, and, as I view it, wide-visioned in the problems that lie before us.

I will not promise, in order to win your forgiveness, that I will not have something more to say further on during the session. I think I may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE].

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I just want to say that I neglected to state that I do not remember whether there was a roll call or not, but I voted against the increase of the salaries of the judges.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I am not going to take a moment of the time of the Senate. I move to amend the bill in line 21, page 10, by striking out "\$2,400" and inserting "\$2,800."

Mr. President, this is to increase the salary of the "clerk on Journal work for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be selected by the Official Reporters." The man who has done this work so efficiently, I understand, has been in the service for 38 years, and he has not lost a day. He is getting now only \$2,400 a year. The fidelity and efficiency with which he performs his duties call for recognition at the hands of the Senate.

This is but a very small increase. I intended to make it \$3,000, but after consultation with Senators it was thought to raise the salary \$400 would be a substantial help to this efficient servant of the Senate. I sincerely hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN].

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment. I propose to increase the salary of the chief clerk in the office of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, on page 56, line 14, by striking out "\$2,250" and inserting "\$2,500."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 56, on line 14, "Office of Surgeon General of Public Health Service, chief clerk," after the words "chief clerk" and the comma strike out "\$2,250," and in lieu thereof insert "\$2,500."

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, this increase has been recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury on the recommendation of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. The work of this chief clerk has been very efficient and has increased very much in the last two or three years. The field force in the Public Health Service has grown from 1,500 to 4,000, while the clerical force in the bureau in Washington has trebled in number. In addition, a number of new offices of the service have been established in Washington, and the service now occupies space in five different parts of the city.

The chief clerk not only discharges the duties of chief clerk, including the care of buildings, but also is acting as Chief of the Miscellaneous Division of the bureau, which has charge of the printing and distribution to the public of health publications and posters. This work is one requiring energy and administrative ability, and is growing so successfully that already this fiscal year there have been sent to the public over 12,000,000 copies of publications and posters as compared with about 4,000,000 in the whole of last year. The previous year the number was about 2,500,000.

This division was formerly in charge of a junior officer of the service, whose salary is thus saved to the Government.

I merely wish to add one word more. The private secretary to the Surgeon General had his salary raised on this bill from \$1,800 to \$2,000. I certainly think the chief clerk ought to have his salary raised \$250 when the Secretary of the Treasury advocated an increase of \$500.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senate, if they agree to this amendment we ought to begin at the beginning of the bill and go right through it and change the salaries of the chief clerks of many of the departments who have a great deal more work to do than the chief clerk of this office.

Senators ought to realize that there must be some little consistency in an appropriation bill which provides for the salaries of the employees of the Government. You can not have one

chief clerk in one department drawing \$250 or \$500 more than another chief clerk perhaps doing more work and who is drawing \$2,250.

In regard to the statement made by the Senator from Louisiana that the salary of the private secretary to the Surgeon General was increased from \$1,800 to \$2,000, and therefore the salary of the chief clerk ought to be increased, I am not going to take the time to tell the Senate why that increased salary was granted, but I will say that it was granted at the personal solicitation of the head of the department, who gave the reasons why. As far as I was concerned, I thought he ought to have just as much as the chief clerk, if the statements made to the committee were correct, but the committee decided to give \$2,000. Now, if the Senate wants to give more, well and good, but I want to notify the Senate now that the whole bill will be unbalanced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL].

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KENYON. At the request of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who has been compelled to leave the Chamber, I offer in his behalf the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. At the bottom of page 151, after section 3, insert:

That the heads of the several executive departments and other governmental establishments in the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to furnish to such civilian employees receiving compensation, exclusive of the additional \$120, at the rate of not more than \$1,400 per annum or less than \$100 per annum, under their respective jurisdiction as have come to the District of Columbia since April 6, 1917, whose services are no longer required and whose employment has been or may be terminated by the Government without delinquency or misconduct on their part, or who may resign from their positions, during the period from November 11, 1918, to March 31, 1919, inclusive, their actual railroad transportation, including sleeping-car accommodations, from the District of Columbia to the place from which they accepted employment or to their legal residence, or to such other place not a greater distance, as the employee may elect. Such transportation must be applied for within 10 days after the termination of service and shall be used within five days after issuance, unless an extension of time on account of illness be granted by the proper authority. As to the employees whose services have been terminated during the period between November 11, 1918, and the date of the passage of this act, inclusive, the time within which transportation shall be applied for shall be 20 days from the date of the passage of this act. Any person who shall sell, exchange, or transfer such transportation for the use of another shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$100. The expenses authorized by this act shall be paid from the following appropriations for the fiscal year 1920, which hereby are made available therefor immediately upon approval of this act:

For the War Department, from "Temporary employees."

For the Navy Department, from "Temporary employees."

For all other executive departments and independent establishments, from the appropriations for the support of the services in which such persons are employed. Any employee who would be entitled to transportation, including sleeping-car accommodation under this act, and who has left the District of Columbia prior to the passage of this act, but not before December 10, 1918, upon application and presentation within 60 days after the passage of this act of proper proof, shall have refunded the cost of actual railroad transportation, including sleeping-car accommodation, from the District of Columbia to the place from which employment was accepted, or to their legal residence, or to such other place not a greater distance to which the employee may have gone. The provisions made for the transportation of employees shall not apply to those who enter such service after the passage of this act.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the only difference between this amendment and the present law is that the words "or who may resign from their positions" are used at the top of page 2, which is the real purpose of the act if it is passed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I think this amendment is to carry out what Congress attempted to do a few weeks or a month ago, and the department construed it the other way. So I have no objection to letting the amendment go into the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to be added to the bill as a new section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, as a new section, the following:

SEC. —. Any moneys remaining in the Treasury after the passage of this act shall be divided among the departments, to be divided as the heads thereof shall determine.

[Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair supposes the amendment is not in order. Does the Senator insist on a vote? If so, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. OVERMAN. I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 34, after line 18, it is proposed to insert:

That the period of time during which soldiers and sailors, both enlisted and drafted men, who, prior to entering the service of their country, had a civil-service status, and whose names appear upon the eligible list of the Civil Service Commission, shall not be counted against them in the determination of their eligibility for appointment under the law, rules, and regulations of the Civil Service Commission now in effect, and at the time of demobilization their civil-service status shall be the same as when they entered the service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator from North Carolina that what he desires is, I think, already provided for in the pending bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I ask that the amendment be again stated. I did not catch the first part of it, but I think it is already covered.

Mr. OVERMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I simply desire to say that I think there has been a provision inserted in the bill requiring the different departments to reinstate soldiers and sailors in the positions which they occupied at the time they entered the military service.

Mr. OVERMAN. Of course, that is the law; but this amendment provides that where a man is on the eligible list and was drafted or enlisted or volunteered and went to the front that time shall not be counted against him. Otherwise one year's absence would bar him from appointment after he is on the eligible list.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the amendment be again stated, Mr. President. If all it does is as stated by the Senator from North Carolina, then, of course, I have no objection to it.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is all it does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be again stated.

The Secretary again stated the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. That is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is adopted.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, just a moment. I have some objection to the amendment unless it is modified. My objection merely is that I desire to insert the word "marines" in the amendment. Marines are not classified either as soldiers or sailors.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have no objection to that modification of the amendment. I had never thought of that.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is all I desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the modification of the amendment suggested by the Senator from Georgia and accepted by the Senator from North Carolina will be made. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, on page 32, line 14, I move to strike out "\$3,500" and to insert "\$4,000." This amendment relates to the Civil Service Commission. Down to this time the Chief of the Civil Service Commission has received a salary of \$4,500 and each of the other commissioners has received a salary of \$4,000, while the chief examiner has received a salary of \$3,500. The chief examiner, as is well known to everyone, is Mr. George R. Wales. He has been with the commission ever since its organization. He is a walking encyclopedia of knowledge relating to the law and the operation of the law. Since the beginning of the war he has worked anywhere from 16 to 20 hours a day.

Mr. McKELLAR. How much does the Senator's proposed amendment increase his salary?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. By \$500. The House has increased the salaries of the commissioners \$1,000, and his salary has always been within \$500 of the salaries of the commissioners. So I do not ask for a thousand-dollar increase for him, but I shall ask to have his salary made \$4,000 instead of \$3,500, for the reason I have stated.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not desire to take up any time on this matter. I have no doubt that the gentleman to whom this amendment refers is a very capable and meritorious man, but I want again to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that there must be some place where we have got to stop. The salary was increased, my understanding is, last year. I am informed that the salary of this officer was then increased by \$500. I repeat, I think the Senate must draw the line some-

where if it expects to get the amendments proposed by the Senate to this bill agreed to by the other House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, on page 134, after the comma, in line 8, I move to insert the words "for the issuance of certificates describing the quality of sample goods submitted for test to the bureau."

The section to which the amendment is proposed provides for the testing of materials, and I desire to have it cover certificates showing what the tests would justify. It does not add anything to the appropriation.

Mr. SMOOT. To whom would such certificates be issued?

Mr. OWEN. They would be issued to the party who submitted the sample of goods for test in the bureau. The bureau does make the tests now.

Mr. SMOOT. I know they make the tests now.

Mr. OWEN. But by giving the parties having the tests made a certificate that the goods were of a certain standard they would be enabled to sell the goods abroad, which they can not now do in a proper way. In the case of a sale of cement to Argentina, for instance, until the Bureau of Standards passed upon the quality of the cement and its value, the parties desiring to sell it would be unable to make disposition of the goods. So this will serve that purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. The object of the amendment, then, is that the Government shall pay the expense instead of the person who has the test made? Under existing conditions parties having had the test made can get a certificate from the bureau showing the test which has been made upon cement or any other commodity.

Mr. OWEN. The bureau does make such tests.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to know whether the Senator from Oklahoma really intends that hereafter such certificates shall be issued without any cost whatever to the party requesting the test?

Mr. OWEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I regret very much that it falls to me to propose an amendment, because I can expect very little. On page 26, line 12, the Senate has imposed a limitation upon itself which I should like to remove. The proviso in line 12 reads as follows:

Provided, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$3,000 per annum.

That refers to the legislative reference library, or division, as it is more properly called, I think. That is a bureau organized to serve Congress. We want the best service we can get. It supplies us with the latest data as to legislation upon any subject by any State or country in the world, as, for example, the laws enacted, together with intelligent comment and criticisms thereon. The legislative reference library supplies us with the best current information on both sides of important questions as they press upon us for consideration.

We have added in this bill to the duties of the legislative reference library another very important function, namely, to make for the use of the Senate and the House of Representatives a digest of every bill that is introduced in Congress. That is work of the highest importance; and yet we put a limitation of \$3,000 upon the pay of anybody employed in the legislative reference library. If you will turn to the page of this bill—I have not noted the page—where provision is made for the pay of the Efficiency Bureau, which is designed to promote the highest efficiency in the executive departments, it will be seen that under the bill 18 employees in that bureau may receive salaries above \$3,000.

In all States where they have a legislative reference library higher salaries are being paid than the limitations which we propose to put upon our own legislative reference library. The State of California pays \$4,000 to the head of its legislative reference library, the State of Illinois pays \$5,000 to the head of its legislative reference division or library, the State of Pennsylvania pays \$5,000 to the head of its legislative reference library and \$5,000 to the assistant librarian, and the State of Wisconsin pays \$4,500 to the official in charge of its legislative reference library.

We have now at the head of the legislative reference library, I believe, a very superior man. I am apprehensive that he will be drawn away from us with this limitation upon his salary; and I offer this amendment for the consideration of the Senate,

that, after the word "That," in line 12, page 26, there be stricken out the word "no" and there be inserted the words "not more than one" in lieu thereof, or so that it will read:

Provided, That not more than one person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$3,000.

That will leave it, I think, to the Librarian of Congress to determine as to any increase that may be found necessary in that position.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not ask for an increase in the appropriation?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, there is an amendment that I desire to explain for just a moment. Personally I should like to have seen the bonus of \$360 added to the salary of Government employees receiving up to \$2,500, but that went out on a point of order. I should like to offer an amendment to give the \$360 bonus to those receiving salaries of \$1,200 or less, but that would also be subject to a point of order, and therefore I shall not offer it.

Mr. President, we have increased a good many salaries in this bill; and I desire to propose an amendment to correct what I think is a very grave injustice and inequality. In the act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, we provided for increases of 5 and 10 per cent in the salaries of certain employees of the Government. Then for the year ending June 30, 1919, we changed that, and gave those receiving up to \$2,500 an increase of \$120 a year, but provided that if they had received an increase at the rate of \$200 per annum they should not get the benefit of the \$120. The result of that was that employees and workmen in the navy yards and in the arsenals who had obtained an increase of wages at a rate which, if they had received it for the whole year, would amount to over \$200, although they received this rate for only a part of that time, did not get the benefit of the increase.

In other words, to illustrate, here are the facts: On July 1, 1918, employees in the navy yard got a basic increase of 8 cents a day—I hope Senators will note these facts, because I think they will appeal to them—until November 8, and then they got an increase of 56 cents a day. The 56 cents and 8 cents made a total rate of 64 cents a day. That for 313 days in the year would give them a rate of increase of \$200.32. Now, Mr. President, it was held that they were not entitled to the increase of \$120 because of this 32 cents over \$200 which they would have gotten if they had received the 64 cents increase every day in the year.

I do not think that is just; I do not believe that that was what was intended by Congress when we put this \$200 limitation in. I think the idea of Congress was that if they got an increase of \$200 in a year, then they should not get the \$120. Therefore to correct that inequality I wish to propose the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 153, in line 23, after the word "salary," it is proposed to strike out the words "at the rate," and in line 24, after "\$200," to strike out the words "per annum."

Mr. JONES of Washington. That will make it read:

Or shall receive during the fiscal year 1920 an increase of salary in excess of \$200.

It seems to me that that is entirely fair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask for a division, Mr. President.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 101, it is proposed to strike out, after the words "class 2," in line 3, the words "89 of class 1, 77 at \$1,000 each; 65 copyists; 26 copyists, at \$720 each," and insert in lieu thereof the words, "100 of class 1, 120 at \$1,000 each; 23 copyists."

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I feel certain that the Senator in charge of the bill will make no objection to this amendment. It does not increase the appropriation; on the other hand, it has the effect of reducing the appropriation by a few thousand dollars. Under this bill, as it has already been framed, if this amendment is adopted there will be an actual reduction in the appropriation, amounting to \$3,800 or \$3,900.

The reason for this amendment is this: At the salaries which are provided in this section of the bill, the General Land Office has been unable to get people to fill the positions. There have been 30 or 40 vacancies in these positions for a number of months. Occasionally the General Land Office will get an employee who will fill the position for a time, and then resign because he can not live upon the amount of the salary. So there are at the present time about 40 vacancies in these positions. The salaries range from \$900 to \$1,200 per year.

It is proposed by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, instead of having the large number of positions authorized by the bill, that a lesser number be authorized and that the salaries may be slightly increased. That is what this amendment does; it lessens the number, but increases the compensation, and by lessening the number it reduces the amount of compensation under this bill by reason of the \$240 per annum bonus. It is desired very much by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and I am sure it will result in benefit to the public service.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I do not know what can be done in conference, but if he will allow it to go to conference with a free hand I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I dislike to leave it just in that way. Of course, it will go with a free hand to conference.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I mean by that that I have not given the consideration to it that I desire. I do not care to oppose the amendment, but I do not wish to commit myself unequivocally until I have given it more study.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I realize that all that I can hope for is that the Senator in charge of the bill will give consideration to it; and, if the Senate adopts it, that he will insist upon it, unless some very cogent reason is given for its rejection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That will be the attitude undoubtedly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Alabama that two or three Senators have expressed to me a very serious doubt as to whether or not the suggestion I made with reference to the commission could be covered in the conference without being subject to a point of order, if reported. So I wish to read a crude suggestion which I will ask the Senator to allow to be put in, to be considered in conference, if he has no objection. After the word "Speaker," in line 21, on page 158, I move to insert:

Provided, That if three Senators and three Representatives of the Sixty-fifth Congress who will not be Members of the Sixty-sixth Congress will serve on such commission they shall be appointed thereon as herein provided, and said commission shall submit its report and recommendations as early as possible, and, in any event, by the first Monday in December, 1919, and the members of such commission shall receive a compensation at the rate of \$625 per month.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I said to the Senator this evening, I am very glad he has made that suggestion; I think it is a wise one; but I want some freedom of action concerning it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. What commission is that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is not in order unless the vote by which the committee amendment was adopted is reconsidered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to may be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to reconsidering the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I merely desire to offer the amendment, so that it may go to conference.

Mr. ASHURST. To what does the amendment relate? What does it mean?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is an amendment in regard to the commission to be provided for the purpose of reclassifying and readjusting salaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is proposed to the amendment reported by the committee establishing a commission to reclassify salaries. The amendment of the Senator from Washington proposes a different personnel from the one proposed by the committee amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is offered so that the suggestion may be considered in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to reconsidering the vote whereby the committee amendment was agreed to? The Chair hears none.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Now the amendment I have proposed comes in after the word "Speaker," in line 21, on page 158.

The SECRETARY. In the amendment of the committee, on page 158, line 21, after the word "Speaker," it is proposed to insert the amendment read by Mr. JONES of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to offer one or two amendments that will, if adopted, save some money and not take money out of the Treasury of the United States. I offer the amendment I send to the desk to come in on page 161, after line 13.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, do I understand the Senator from Utah is trying to save some money for the Treasury?

Mr. SMOOT. I will have to admit the charge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Utah will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 161, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following as a new section:

SEC. 10. The Joint Committee on Printing shall have power to adopt and employ such measures as, in its discretion, may be deemed necessary to remedy any neglect, delay, duplication, or waste in the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications: *Provided*, That hereafter no journal, magazine, periodical, or other similar publication shall be printed and issued by any branch or officer of the Government service unless the same shall have been specifically authorized by Congress, but such publications as are now being printed without specific authority from Congress, may, in the discretion of the Joint Committee on Printing, be continued until the close of the next regular session of Congress, when, if authority for their continuance is not then granted by Congress, they shall not thereafter be printed: *Provided further*, That on and after July 1, 1919, all printing, binding, and blank-book work for Congress, the Executive office, the judiciary, and every executive department, independent office, and establishment of the Government shall be done at the Government Printing Office, except such classes of work as shall be deemed by the Joint Committee on Printing to be urgent or necessary to have done elsewhere than in the District of Columbia for the exclusive use of any field service outside of said District.

Mr. SMOOT. The exceptions, Mr. President, I wish to say, are the exceptions now in the existing law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to offer one more amendment, to be added at the end of the bill as a separate section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the amendment just agreed to, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 11. George Washington Memorial Building: The provisions and limitations respecting the George Washington Memorial Building in the sundry civil act for the fiscal year 1918 are hereby continued and extended to March 4, 1920.

Mr. SMOOT. I will state that that is only an extension of one year to the charitable people of the United States to collect the money for the erection of the George Washington Memorial Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. SMOOT conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13462) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, and agreed to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SMALL, Mr. SCULLY, and Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 5236) to amend sections 7, 10, and 11 of the Federal reserve act, and section 5172, Revised Statutes of the United States, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees

to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. PHELAN, Mr. EAGLE, and Mr. HAYES managers at the conference on the part of the House.

DISCHARGED SICK AND DISABLED SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. HARDWICK. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13026) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers and sailors.

Mr. THOMAS. I shall have to object—

Mr. HARDWICK. I am not going to ask the Senate to go on with it to-night.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I give notice now that immediately after the bill which the Senator from Georgia has called up is disposed of I shall ask the Senate to take up the bill (H. R. 15462) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. House bill 13026 is before the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. I shall ask to be heard upon some of the provisions of the bill. It is too important to be considered now.

Mr. SMOOT. Let us have time enough to read it, anyhow. We have been so engaged that we have not had an opportunity to give attention to it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Very well. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, it seems to me that we ought to have an opportunity to consider the conference report on the oil-leasing bill, and I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 21, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 20, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, since we pass this way but once give us the grace to follow the star of hope which illumines the way and points the course to human progress.

May we not pause to mourn and agonize over past sins, but sincerely repent, turn to the right, keep to the right, that we may build for ourselves a character which shall enable us to do unto others as we would be done by.

We pray for a league of nations which shall stand for permanent peace, but more for a league of Christian churches which shall lift them above creeds and dogmas and place them upon the fundamental principles taught and illustrated in the sublime life and character of the Jesus of Nazareth. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GEORGES CLEMENCEAU.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HUSTED. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, we have all been deeply shocked by the announcement of the dastardly and murderous attack upon the life of the French premier. I made two trips to France during this war and was deeply impressed by many things, but by nothing more, I think, than the marvelous influence of that old tiger of France in sustaining and maintaining the morale of the French Army and of the French people under the most trying circumstances. He exposed his life at the front as freely as any French poilu. His presence there inspired the troops, and then he went back home and fired the civilian population with patriotic fervor. Georges Clemenceau is the great outstanding figure of this war, overtopping them all, even Marshal